

bill or other like legislation which will prevent the punishment or destruction of persons accused or suspected of crime in any other way or by any other authority than by due process of law and by a duly constituted court of justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

776. Also, petition of the Legislature of New York State, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact with all convenient speed such legislation as may be necessary to abolish the Federal gasoline sales tax and to surrender to the States exclusively the power to tax such sales in the future; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

777. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of H. C. Stickel and 30 residents of Dawson, Fayette County, Pa., and vicinity, favoring old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

778. By Mr. TABER: Petitions of A. Peters and 19 other citizens of Catoosa County, Ga., favoring old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

779. Also, petitions of J. A. Massey and 15 other citizens of Dade County; Omer Peter Roberson and 14 other citizens of Floyd County; Sarah Pace and 19 other citizens of Floyd County; Margaret Jenkins and 14 other citizens of Dade County; Kiggie Nelson and 6 other citizens of Bartow County; Ella Cash and 15 other citizens of Haralson County, Ga., favoring old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

780. Also, petitions of Mary M. Edwards and 17 other citizens of Chattooga County; Emma Smith and 6 other citizens of Floyd County; Walter L. Rogers and 16 other citizens of Murray County; Mrs. Malley Rich and 9 other citizens of Murray County; J. F. McDonald and 14 other citizens of Haralson County; D. W. Long and 2 other citizens of Gordon County; Mrs. J. A. Beaver and 10 other citizens of Walker County, Ga., favoring old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

781. By Mr. TURNER: Petitions (56) from National Old Age Pension Association and the Non-Partisan Voters' Secret League, regarding House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

782. By Mr. WALLGREN: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Washington, approving immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

783. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Petition of mayor and city council of the city of Brockton, Mass., urging the immediate reopening of the shoe code in justice to shoe workers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord God, Thou who art the abiding reality of the universe, we wait at Thy mercy seat in prayer. Everything that is best is here: the supreme pattern of character and where is inspired the essential principle of a good life. Send us forth with the ideal that we shall help the world while in the world we stay. May we never allow our conscience to be dulled or our affections chilled toward our fellow men where the lamp of happiness glows dim and gray. Do Thou enable us to hold to the realities of power, greatness, and everlasting joy by avoiding the false and flattering things of life. O Father of Light, O Spirit Divine, touch our souls that we may breathe the ampler air of meditation and devotion; delight the inner eye with constant vision of the pure and beautiful; lead us to drink afresh of the eternal fountain and rejoice in the glory of a golden sun and a purple sky. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CLERK'S OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., February 5, 1935.

The SPEAKER THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: There is on file in this office a certificate of election in due form of law showing the election of Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK as a Representative to the Seventy-fourth Congress from the Second Congressional District of the State of Indiana to fill the vacancy in that district.

Yours very truly,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from the Second Congressional District of the State of Indiana, Mr. CHARLES A. HALLECK, is present and desires to take the oath of office.

Mr. HALLECK appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS ARE NOT YET A REALITY

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLENBOGEN. Mr. Speaker, there is a tremendous and well-nigh unanimous sentiment today in every section of the country for genuine old-age pensions. Therefore I want to examine how much that sentiment has been able to crystallize itself into laws.

What old-age pension laws do we have today? What are their provisions? Do they provide old-age pensions? Are they genuine? Or do they exist in name only?

With this information before us we can then establish what old-age-pension laws we should have and what the prospects for obtaining them are.

STATE OLD-AGE PENSIONS AS THEY EXIST TODAY DO NOT PROVIDE REAL SECURITY FOR THE AGED

There are 28 States in the Union and 2 Territories, Alaska and Hawaii, which have old-age-pension laws. In 8 of these 28 States the laws exist only on the statute books. No old-age pensions whatever are being paid. In 10 other States very little is paid out on old-age pensions, so that in 18 States out of the 28 old-age-pension laws exist only on paper and not in reality.

Even in the other States the old-age-pension laws are inadequate. In these 10 States, 6 provide for an age limit of 70 years and 4 for an age limit of 65 years. And note this: There is not a single State or Territory in the Union which provides for old-age pensions at 60 years.

The best old-age-pension laws in the Nation are those of the States of New York and Massachusetts. These States do not establish a specific maximum pension, thus permitting persons to receive as much as is needed for a decent and healthy life. For instance, in the city of New York the pension is higher than elsewhere in the State, because the cost of living is higher in larger cities. The average pension for the State of New York as a whole for 1933 was \$22.16; for New York City the average probably amounts to around \$40.

EVEN THE BEST OF THE STATE OLD-AGE-PENSION LAWS HAVE SERIOUS DEFECTS

But even the old-age-pension laws of New York State and of Massachusetts have serious defects. They do not give a pension until a person is 70 years of age and provide that the pensioner must have resided in the State for at least 10 years.

According to the census figures of 1930 New York State had 373,878 persons 70 years of age and over, and therefore eligible. Of these only 51,228, or 13.7 percent, were receiving pensions in 1933. The total amount of old-age pensions paid out by the State of New York in 1933 amounted to \$13,592,080.

Let me give some more figures: Of the 28 States I have mentioned, 14 States provide a minimum age limit of 70 years, 13 a minimum age limit of 65 years, and 1 a minimum age limit of 68 years; 15 States provide for a maximum pay-

ment of \$30, 6 States for a maximum of \$25, 2 States for a maximum of \$20, and 3 States provide for less than \$20 per aged person.

PENNSYLVANIA HAS NO OLD-AGE-PENSION LAW IN ANY REAL SENSE

Now, what about my own State, Pennsylvania? Pennsylvania does have an old-age-pension law, because our supreme court said we could not have one. It will therefore be necessary to amend the constitution of the State of Pennsylvania before it can have a real old-age-pension law.

Pennsylvania does have an old-age-assistance law. It was passed in January 1934, but did not take effect until December 1, 1934. To be eligible for old-age assistance in Pennsylvania a person must be at least 70 years old, must be a citizen for at least 15 years, and must have lived in Pennsylvania for at least 15 years prior to the date of making application. The maximum amount allowed is \$30 per month.

It is an unsatisfactory law. The age limit is far too high and the residence requirement is far too long. But even most of those who have qualified under this inadequate law will be unable to receive a pension, because the legislature refused to appropriate a sufficient amount to pay these pensions.

THE UNITED STATES CENSUS FIGURES PROVE THE LACK OF ECONOMIC PROTECTION IN OLD AGE

Let me give a few more figures. According to the 1930 census there were 6,663,805 persons 65 years of age and over in the United States and 3,836,200 persons 70 years of age and over. By 1933 that number had increased considerably. Compare with these figures the fact that in 1933 there were only 180,003 persons in the United States who were receiving pensions, and that the total amount of pensions for all the States in the Union amounted to only \$31,192,492.

THE THREE CHIEF DIVISIONS OF THE ADMINISTRATION'S SECURITY PROGRAM

And now let us examine, in the administration's economic-security bill pending before Congress, those provisions which are designed to give security in old age.

The bill's provisions for old-age security are divided into three parts:

First. Straight pensions for those who are now aged.

Second. Federal old-age insurance for all employees under 60 years of age and making less than \$250 per month.

Third. To nonmanual employees who make more than \$250 per month the Government will sell an annuity to begin when the insured reaches 65 years of age.

THE OLD-AGE-PENSION PROVISIONS—MY OBJECTIONS TO SOME OF THESE PROVISIONS

Let me review all three provisions very briefly.

The first is a straight old-age-pension plan which is designed to give pensions—I say pensions and not insurance—to those who are now old. These pensions are to be provided and paid under State laws. The Federal Government will contribute one-half of the expenditures of each State for such pensions, but not in excess of \$15 per month for each person.

In order to participate in the Federal grant, States must pay pensions to every citizen 65 years of age or over, but—and this is very important—the 65-year age limit does not apply until January 1, 1940; that is to say, until 1940 a State may have a pension law providing for payments to those who are at least 70 years of age.

THE AGE LIMIT MUST BE REDUCED TO CARE FOR THE VICTIMS OF INDUSTRY

Mr. Speaker, I emphatically object to this provision. We have always provided for the veterans of wars. We must now provide for the veterans of industry. Most large industrial concerns refuse to employ persons over 45 years of age. What are they to do? How are they to find a job? How are they going to live? Are they to starve? A man of 45 is too young to be thrown on the scrap heap.

Old-age pensions should begin at 60—not at 65; and let me emphasize that the bill as now drawn does not even guarantee that the State laws will pay pensions to those at 65. Under the present draft, until 1940 State laws can provide, as they do now provide in most instances, that pensions shall not begin until 70 years of age.

That, I say, must be changed. I am willing to give the States sufficient time to change their laws and to adopt new ones, but we do not need to wait until 1940 in order to reduce the limits of the present laws from 70 to 65 years.

I propose that the act of Congress shall give the States 1 or 2 years to reduce their age limit. That age limit should be 60 years and not 65. As now drafted, the law of Congress would prohibit Federal contributions to those who are between 60 and 65 years. That must be changed.

If the Federal law does not compel the States to have their payments begin at 60, it should at least permit the States to do so. That is the very least to which our aged are entitled.

MORE LIBERAL CONTRIBUTIONS ARE NECESSARY

Further, the law should not fix a maximum pension, but should provide that the pension payments should be sufficient to insure healthy and decent living conditions for the aged. If a limit must be fixed, let it be \$40 for cities, with a Federal contribution of one-half—\$20 per month—per pensioner.

OLD-AGE INSURANCE—ITS BENEFITS SHOULD BEGIN AT 60

Second. The second part of the Federal program provides for compulsory old-age insurance by the Federal Government for employees less than 60 years of age. Under this insurance system those who are now young would, by their own and by the contribution of their employer, pay for their security when they become aged. When they become 65 years of age they would be entitled to an annuity payable every month, the amount of the annuity to depend on the amount of the contribution made.

This system is planned to take effect in January 1937, with a contribution of 1 percent from all those who are employed, to be divided equally between employer and employee. That contribution is to be increased every 5 years by another percent, so that in 1957 it would be 5 percent of the salary received, equally divided between employer and employee. This compulsory-insurance system should provide for benefits to begin at the age of 60 and not at the age of 65. That is the one change upon which those who favor security for our aged should insist.

Third. Under the third phase of the plan the Federal Government will sell annuities to those who have an average income of more than \$250 per month. If they desire, they will be permitted to buy annuities from the Government and receive a life pension at the age of 65. In this case also the age limit should be reduced to 60 years.

THE SECURITY PROGRAM SHOULD BE LIBERALIZED, BUT EVEN AS IT STANDS IT IS A GREAT STEP FORWARD TOWARD ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PEACE AND SECURITY

The bill now pending in Congress is sound in principle and sound in most of its provisions. Even if no amendments are made to it, it will be a tremendous step forward. It will bring security to hundreds of thousands of aged who are now on relief rolls, 700,000 of them over 65 years of age, or who are dependent upon the charity of children who can ill afford to support them. I say that even if the proposed law is not amended it will force every State in the Union to make liberal changes in their laws in favor of the aged.

The Federal program is a great step forward. It can be made even more forward looking, more beneficial, if the age limit is reduced to 60 years. The Federal contribution should be increased from \$15 to \$20 per aged person, so that States may be able to pay \$40 per month in cities where the cost of living is high.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are on our way. We are swiftly moving forward. I ask each and everyone of you to give us your assistance.

If that is done, the poorhouse will at last be abolished. At last men and women of older years will be able to spend their days in decency, in peace, and in security in their own homes.

ROBERT E. LEE

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech I made last night to the Daughters of the Confederacy on Robert E. Lee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEE of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech I made at the Confederate Memorial Hall, Washington, D. C., February 4, 1935, at the presentation of a painting of Robert E. Lee, by Mr. Albert Fawcett Duggan, to the Robert E. Lee Chapter No. 644, of the United Daughters of the Confederacy:

What more could a speaker ask than to have an audience composed of the Daughters of the Confederacy and be assigned the subject of Robert E. Lee?

Being a southerner, my chest swells with pride at the mention of the name of Robert E. Lee; and because my own name is Lee, I take particular pride in delivering this address. I have been told by my father, who was born at Monroe, N. C., that we belonged to the same family of Lees. I have never traced the lineage back to prove it or to disprove it. I have been content to believe it. He belonged to the South, and we are all a part of that South. Therefore he belongs to all of us. We can scarcely honor him, but we honor ourselves by honoring him.

Today Mr. Albert Fawcett Duggan, of North Dakota, has presented this chapter of the Daughters of the Confederacy with a painting of Robert E. Lee. I do not know, sir, where you received the inspiration that caused you to select the hero of the South for your subject. You may have gleaned it from the reluctant testimony of historians, you may have caught it from the admissions of military critics, or you may have received it by the fire-side of a southern cabin. It may have come from the sweet lips of your mother. It may be the heritage of a grandfather who wore the gray, or perchance it may have come from the soul of the black mammy nurse who crooned you to sleep in the chimney corner.

No matter whether you first heard of him as Gen. Robert Edward Lee, or as "Mars Robert", you have this day honored your craft and glorified your colors.

Mr. Duggan, it is my pleasure to express the gratitude of this chapter for your gift. You have done a noble thing. Your own character is reflected by your deed. We can take a man's gage by the house he builds, by the book he reads, by the music he loves, and by the portrait he paints.

You are greater by having painted Robert E. Lee. Did you not feel the breath of the man as you fashioned that noble brow? Was there not the strength of leadership in the strong lines of his nose? While you were painting his eyes, tell us, did you not peer into those windows and catch a glimpse of that great white soul? And while you were mixing the colors for the lights and shadows that made that handsome beard did you not sense the classical features underneath it that told of culture and courage dating back for generations?

May I here acknowledge that many of the facts and quotations used herein were taken from *The Noble Enemy*, an oration by my friend, Hicks Epton, of Wewoka, Okla. Much of the imagery and some of the figures of speech were inspired by that oration.

Who were the forebears of Robert E. Lee? One was a crusader who bore arms with Richard the Lionhearted. Another was companion of King Charles II. His own father was Governor of Virginia, "Lighthorse" Harry Lee, the unquenchable flame of the American Revolution.

Robert E. Lee was born in Virginia. The placid Potomac knew his whistle as he imitated the call of the bobwhite. He grew to young manhood in the culture of the Old South. The strumming of the old banjo and the songs of the plantation darkeys were familiar to his ears. He had seen the dark corn tassel and ripen under the soft blue of Virginia skies as the seasons passed.

Then he went to West Point. There the blood of his fathers tingled in his veins as he marched in grand review. On graduation day only one cadet stood ahead of him in a large class of over a hundred.

Then came the Mexican campaign to try the metal of the soldier. He himself was unseasoned, so far as campaigning was concerned, and leading raw recruits crossed the Mexican border. The fine trappings of West Point were not needed here. The fine precision of close-order drill was forgotten. On he led his men leaving the Rio Grande, crossing the seared sands of Mexico, through cactus and mesquite; on they went with dry canteens and parched lips, with scarce a foe to oppose them except the blazing heat of the sun.

At last they faced Cerro Gordo, a beetle-browed mountain, a natural fortress, an impregnable pass, coxcombed with cannon. Forty-two engines of death frowned down upon Lee and his men, and 13,000 Mexican warriors lay securely behind those guns. Every rock and boulder bristled with bayonets and the cunning old Santa Ana smiled as he thought how perfectly his plans had worked. The raw recruits were going to give battle. He had selected this impregnable position with care.

The grizzled old General Scott looked and swore that it was impossible to dislodge Santa Ana. But Lee accepted the odds and ordered an attack. He led his men up the mountain in the face of the withering fire. The artillery blasted the rock from the mountain side. But Lee took the impregnable position of Santa Ana, and "the land of the Montezumas lay at his feet."

General Scott once said:

"If a great battle were about to be fought, for the liberty, or slavery, of the country and I had to pick the general, I would say

with my dying breath, 'Let it be Robert E. Lee; he is the greatest soldier on earth.'"

After the successful Mexican campaigns Lee returned to Virginia, hoping for a peaceful life, but to find a cloud rising on the horizon of his own country. It grew blacker and more threatening until the lightning flashed out from Fort Sumter and rent his own beloved Nation in twain.

President Lincoln, on April 18, offered him command of the entire Northern Army. In the North was wealth; in the South there would be bankruptcy. If he went with the Union there would be honor, glory, and success of arms, but his South was calling to him, the land he loved. It could not be said he wanted slavery; he had freed his slaves 10 years before. No; it was not slavery; it was his Virginia, the land of his father, who was once its Governor. His dead were buried there. The vines of Old Virginia were entwined about his heart. His father's words came to him across the years: "Virginia is my country. Her will I obey, however lamentable the fate to which it may subject me." His father's sword called to him, and he answered.

Then came the dark days of civil war. As a military genius Lee is without a peer. "Outnumbered always", outgeneraled never. In the last days of that war, "For every man that followed Lee four faced him." The English historian Henderson said:

"Lee's victory with 60,000 men over Hooker with 150,000 was the most brilliant of the nineteenth century."

And Fiske grudgingly admits:

"Lee's defensive warfare was among the most wonderful things in history, and imposed itself upon the imagination of the people until they can scarcely believe that he did not win."

Lee was as great in defeat as in victory. He received both Cerro Gordo and Appomattox with the sublime calm of a gentleman. When he handed his sword to the noble Grant at Appomattox his head was high but his heart was literally breaking within him. Not for the loss of military glory, but for his distressed people. It was then that he said, "My Southland needs me now worse than ever", and as president of Washington and Lee University this magnificent "prisoner on parole" closed his life, and, as "Prince once said of monarch slain, 'Taller he seems in death.'"

The darkeys of Virginia say that on dark nights there rides from out of Arlington's cherry blossoms the old Gray Warrior astride his milk-white charger. I like to say with one who followed him, "Ride on alone, Old Man, with duty at the bridle bit."

Sir Artist, in the noble generosity of your heart you meant to honor Robert E. Lee, but he in turn has honored you, for when this canvas has faded, and even when the untiring tooth of time has worn away the images sculptured deep in the granite of old Stone Mountain, the true image of Robert E. Lee will still be engraven in the hearts of southern people.

TARIFF AND FREIGHT REDUCTION NECESSARY FOR FARM RELIEF

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on January 30 I introduced two bills in Congress to which I desire to call attention. One of these bills is for a 15-percent flat reduction in tariff duties on all articles imported on which tariffs are levied. The other bill provides for a 20-percent reduction in freight rates on farm products, including livestock.

Within the past few months almost every farm organization in Texas has adopted resolutions urging substantial reductions in our tariffs and in railroad freight rates. Personally I am in thorough accord with those resolutions. I believe that our tariff wall, together with high transportation costs, constitute the principal cause of the depression with which we have been afflicted the past few years.

When the President signed the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act in 1929 there were then pending with the State Department protests from all the leading commercial nations of the world. Since then these nations, or many of them, have enacted retaliatory tariffs against our commerce. The consequences have been so appalling that the greatest economic experts have not been able to fully estimate the loss.

In all its history the Democratic Party has opposed the policy of high protective tariffs. The people naturally expected that when the Democratic Party came into power it would scale down the tariff wall that they believe had been so destructive of their prosperity. They are now becoming impatient at the delay. Hence the reason for the resolutions that are being adopted by so many of our farm organizations.

Of course, the people generally are not familiar with the almost insurmountable difficulties in the way of securing the passage of a general tariff measure. Both political parties have had sad experiences because of the "pork barrel" methods that have crept in. We are now confronted with more serious difficulties than ever before in our history, owing

to the fact that all other commercial countries have erected retaliatory tariff walls against us. In an effort to get around these difficulties Secretary Hull is now engaged in the laudable undertaking of securing reciprocal agreements in the interest of our trade. These treaties, however, at best, can apply only to a few commodities. In addition to the treaties, we need a general scaling down of the tariff barriers all along the line.

Perhaps it would not be wise at this time to attempt a re-opening and overhauling of all tariff schedules. It might materially interfere with these treaties now being consummated. I believe, however, that a general lowering of our tariff duties along the line I have proposed will be as a guaranty of good faith on our part, and will materially aid in securing reciprocal action on the part of the nations we have offended.

The bill should be easy of passage. It makes no change whatever in the relative status of any line of trade or industry. It simply provides for a general flat reduction of 15 percent, applied alike to all articles embraced in our present law. It would aid in securing reciprocal action on the part of other nations.

As a result of our tariff wars, agriculture has been the principal sufferer. Particularly is this the case as to cotton, wheat, and other major farm crops, of which so large a proportion must find a market abroad. Other nations cannot buy our crops unless we buy something from them. This is a self-evident truth.

I have also introduced a bill for a 20-percent flat reduction in railroad freight rates on all farm products, including livestock. I consider such a reduction as absolutely essential. This proposed 20-percent reduction would not only be in the interest of the farmer but would also be beneficial to the railroads. Not only would the general volume of commerce be increased, but relatively a much larger proportion of it would move by rail. Much of the traffic now handled by truck would then go by rail, and at a profit to the roads.

Monopoly in transportation has ever been the goal of the railroads. Their methods in securing and perpetuating this monopoly have frequently been detrimental to the public interest. In the early period of transportation in this country, the railroads either purchased or leased all the artificial waterways, except the Erie Canal, which was owned by the State of New York. The leases in nearly all cases were for a period of 999 years. The most of these leases yet have approximately 900 years to run. All these artificial waterways or canals, whether leased or purchased outright by the railroads, have long since been junked.

In river transportation, the roads have frequently purchased and then junked the steamboats. In other cases cutthroat rates were applied, rendering it impossible for the boats to operate. In recent years, it has been the method of the railroads to secure legislation that would render competition impossible. Their present program includes the elimination of all ocean ships engaged in the coastwise trade.

A monopoly in transportation for the railroads would entail an enormous cost upon the people of the United States. Agriculture would have to bear an unusually large proportion of this burden. I will give one illustration only, that of a single crop in a single State.

Texas is a large State geographically as well as agriculturally. Due to soil and climatic conditions, cotton is the principal farm crop. It must remain so, perhaps indefinitely, as the brains of the South, plus the brains of the brain trust have not been able to find another agricultural product to reasonably take the place of cotton in Texas. Normally, four to five million bales are produced in that State, comparatively a small crop in proportion to the acreage involved.

Texas has but few cotton mills. Probably less than 1 percent of the cotton produced there is milled in the State. The all-rail freight rate on cotton from the great cotton centers in Texas to the mills in New England render it impossible for cotton to be shipped to those points by rail.

I am advised by the Interstate Commerce Commission that the rail rate from Galveston and Houston to Fall River, New Bedford, and Taunton, Mass., and to Willimantic and

Danielson, Conn., the great cotton-milling cities, is \$1.54 per hundred pounds, or \$7.70 per bale.

The United States Shipping Board informs me that the water rate from the ports of Galveston and Houston to Fall River and New Bedford is 35 cents per hundred pounds, or \$1.75 per bale. The combined water and rail rate from Texas ports to Taunton is 47½ cents per hundred pounds, or \$2.37½ per bale. The combined water and rail rate to Danielson is 52½ cents per hundred, or \$2.62½ per bale.

The ships engaged in our coastwise trade are all American ships. The law prohibits foreign vessels from engaging in this trade. If these ships should be prohibited by law from charging less than the rail rate on cotton from Texas to New England mills—and that is what the railroads are now asking for—it would increase the freight burden of the Texas cotton farmer an average of more than \$5.50 per bale on all cotton shipped to American mills.

If, on account of such freight rates the cotton from Texas, Oklahoma, and other Southwestern States should all be forced into the foreign trade, then the mills of New England would doubtless be compelled to import cotton for domestic use. The present ocean rates on cotton from Texas ports to Europe, and to the Orient, range from \$1.50 to \$1.85 per bale.

We need our railroads, it is true. At the same time, it cannot be denied that we need our farmers, our merchant marine, and our domestic cotton mills. Under fair and equitable laws, all can live and prosper. Greed and avarice are the things to be guarded against.

The bills I have introduced will not injure any class or industry. They will more nearly equalize conditions and aid materially in a general revival of trade and aid recovery.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday during roll call no. 13 I was absent at the hospital receiving treatment. If I had been present and voting, I would have voted "no."

IMPERFORATE, INCOMPLETE, OR SPECIALLY MARKED STAMPS

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 76, which is a privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish to the House of Representatives the following information: (1) Whether imperforate, incomplete, or specially marked stamps have, since January 1, 1933, been issued by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing at the request of or with the consent of the Post Office Department or any officer or employee of that Department; (2) whether imperforate, incomplete, or specially marked stamps, since January 1, 1933, have been knowingly distributed by the Post Office Department, or any officer or employee of that Department, other than through the regular channels of the Post Office Department for sale to the public; (3) whether any stamps of special issues, since January 1, 1933, have been distributed other than through the usual channels of the Post Office Department for sale to the public; and (4) the name or names of officers or employees of the Post Office Department, if any, who have since January 1, 1933, authorized or consented to the distribution of imperforate, incomplete, or specially marked stamps or have distributed such stamps or any stamps other than through the regular channels of sale to the public, and the name or names of the person or persons to whom such distribution has been made and the price or prices, if any, paid by persons receiving such stamps.

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a report which I have been directed to make by the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, and I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read the same.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the gentleman going to give us some information in regard to this before he makes his motion?

Mr. ROMJUE. I was just coming to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ROMJUE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, to whom was referred the resolution (H. Res. 76) requesting information from the Postmaster General, having had the same under consideration,

report it back to the House and recommend that the resolution do not pass.

The action of the committee is based upon the following informative letter from the Post Office Department:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, February 4, 1935.

HON. JAMES M. MEAD,
Chairman Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Since January 1, 1933, 27 varieties of postage stamps have been issued by the Department. A list of these stamps, together with the quantities issued and made available for sale to the public, is attached (exhibit A).

All of these stamps, with the exception of the souvenir sheets, were made available to the public in sheets of either 50 or 100, according to the size of the stamp, which is the usual form in which they are distributed to postmasters. These sheets were perforated and gummed. The 1- and 3-cent Century of Progress souvenir sheets were in panes of 25 stamps, imperforate and ungummed; the souvenir sheets of the 3-cent Little America stamp were in panes of 6 stamps, imperforate and ungummed; the souvenir sheets of 1- and 3-cent National Park stamps were issued imperforate but gummed in panes of 6 stamps.

With the exception of the souvenir stamps, the sheets of stamps first come from the press in 200 subject form, imperforate, and ungummed. Since January 1, 1933, 98 of these sheets (including souvenir sheets) from 20 of the varieties have been presented to high Government officials as specimens of new issues. In filling an order for some stamps, through inadvertence, one of the large sheets was sold to a man in Norfolk, Va. He apparently exhibited this sheet to several dealers in New York and elsewhere and it has been the subject of a great deal of comment in philatelic circles, with a high valuation placed thereon. This man paid \$6, or face value, for this sheet, which went out through error, and the Department is making an effort to recover it.

The records disclose that thousands of die proofs of newly issued stamps and sets of stamps, including those of the postage-due variety, have been given out by previous administrations. It has also been the custom of the Post Office Department during previous administrations to prepare several hundred albums containing specimens of the current issues to be given to the delegates to the international postal conventions. There exists, therefore, several precedents for the furnishing of specimens of stamps, and none of the sheets presented by this administration was in anywise intended for speculation or for sale. On the contrary, it seems that the publicity and complaint on the part of the collectors and philatelists has arisen mainly by reason of exhibition of this sheet of stamps by the man at Norfolk.

There has been no loss to the Government, and I am satisfied that the supposed value placed upon a sheet of these stamps is inflated and fictitious and is merely intended for purposes of criticism.

The Post Office Department has invariably adhered to a policy of providing commemorative stamps for sale to the public in such forms as to be readily usable for postage; that is to say, sheets of convenient size, perforated and gummed. The only deviation from this policy whatever has been the issuance of the small souvenir sheets in imperforate form in honor of philatelic gatherings of unusual importance.

Very respectfully,

C. B. EILENBERGER,
Third Assistant Postmaster General.
Postage stamps issued since Jan. 1, 1933

Description	Denomination	Number issued
	<i>Cents</i>	
General Oglethorpe.....	3	61,729,200
Proclamation of Peace.....	3	73,382,400
Century of Progress.....	1	295,189,300
Do.....	3	304,379,300
Century of Progress souvenir sheets in panes of 25 stamps.....	1	11,588,050
Do.....	3	11,232,500
N. R. A. Emergency.....	3	1,869,145,100
Gen. Thaddeus Kosciuszko.....	5	41,429,200
Little America.....	3	26,300,800
Little America souvenir sheets in panes of 6 stamps.....	3	4,441,650
Maryland Tercentenary.....	3	42,092,700
Mothers.....	3	210,000,000
Wisconsin Tercentenary.....	3	65,000,000
National parks:		
Yosemite.....	1	80,000,000
Grand Canyon.....	2	75,000,000
Mount Rainier.....	3	85,000,000
Mesa Verde.....	4	15,000,000
Yellowstone.....	5	35,000,000
Crater Lake.....	6	15,000,000
Arcadia.....	7	15,000,000
Zion.....	8	15,000,000
Glacier.....	9	15,000,000
Smoky Mountains.....	10	20,000,000
National parks souvenir sheets in panes of 6 stamps:		
Yosemite.....	1	4,800,000
Mount Rainier.....	3	3,000,000
Zeppelin.....	50	3,250,000
Air mail—special delivery.....	16	10,000,000

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to present a motion to lay this resolution on the table. I intend to do that for the reason that rather extensive debate has already been had on this matter, and the committee instructed that the matter be presented in that manner.

Mr. WITHROW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield for a question.

Mr. WITHROW. The adverse report of the committee in this case should in nowise be construed that the committee places its stamp of approval on the Postmaster General deliberately making imperforate stamps to be given away?

Mr. ROMJUE. I am yielding for a question only.

Mr. WITHROW. It should not be so construed—

Mr. ROMJUE. Each Member may construe it as he pleases, so far as I am concerned.

Regular order was demanded.

Mr. MILLARD. Will the gentleman yield for a question before he puts the motion?

Mr. ROMJUE. I yield first to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask if it is not very evident, because of the fact that our friend from New York [Mr. MILLARD] has not even been to the Post Office Department to ask for information, and that he could have gotten it if he had gone there, that this resolution is nothing in the world but a political ambushade and is too picayunish to be worthy of any consideration whatever by the House?

Mr. ROMJUE. I think you are correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SNELL) there were yeas 198 and noes 45.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays. The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 276, nays 102, answered "present" 1, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—276

Arnold	Costello	Frey	Lea, Calif.
Ashbrook	Cox	Fuller	Lee, Okla.
Ayers	Cravens	Gasque	Lesinski
Barden	Crosby	Gassaway	Lewis, Colo.
Beam	Cross, Tex.	Gavagan	Lewis, Md.
Bell	Crosser, Ohio	Gillette	Lloyd
Berlin	Crowe	Gingery	Luckey
Binderup	Cullen	Goldsbrough	Ludlow
Bland	Cummings	Granfield	McAndrews
Blanton	Daly	Gray, Pa.	McClellan
Bloom	Darden	Greenwood	McCormack
Boehne	Deen	Greever	McFarlane
Boland	Delaney	Gregory	McGehee
Boylan	Dempsey	Haines	McGrath
Brennan	Dickstein	Hamlin	McGroarty
Brooks	Dies	Hancock, N. C.	McKeough
Brown, Ga.	Dietrich	Harlan	McLaughlin
Brown, Mich.	Dingell	Hart	McMillan
Brunner	Disney	Harter	McReynolds
Buchanan	Dobbins	Healey	Mahon
Buck	Dockweiler	Higgins, Mass.	Maloney
Buckler, Minn.	Dorsey	Hildebrandt	Mansfield
Bulwinkle	Doughton	Hill, Ala.	Martin, Colo.
Burch	Doxey	Hill, Knute	Mason
Caldwell	Drewry	Hill, Samuel B.	Massingale
Cannon, Mo.	Driscoll	Hobbs	Maverick
Cannon, Wis.	Driver	Hook	Meeks
Carden	Duffey, Ohio	Houston	Merritt, N. Y.
Carmichael	Duffy, N. Y.	Huddleston	Miller
Carpenter	Duncan	Igoe	Mitchell, Ill.
Cartwright	Dunn, Miss.	Imhoff	Mitchell, Tenn.
Cary	Dunn, Pa.	Jenckes, Ind.	Monaghan
Castellow	Eagle	Johnson, Tex.	Montague
Celler	Eckert	Johnson, W. Va.	Moran
Chandler	Edmiston	Jones	Moritz
Chapman	Elcher	Kee	Murdoch
Citron	Ellenbogen	Keller	Nelson
Clalborne	Evans	Kenney	Nichols
Clark, Idaho	Faddis	Kerr	Norton
Clark, N. C.	Farley	Kieberg	O'Brien
Cochran	Ferguson	Kloeb	O'Connell
Coffee	Fernandez	Kniffin	O'Connor
Colden	Fiesinger	Kocalkowski	O'Day
Cole, Md.	Fitzpatrick	Kopplemann	O'Leary
Colmer	Flannagan	Kramer	Oliver
Cooley	Fletcher	Lambeth	O'Malley
Cooper, Tenn.	Ford, Calif.	Lamneck	O'Neal
Corning	Ford, Miss.	Larrabee	Owen

Palmisano	Richardson	Smith, Wash.	Turner
Parks	Robertson	South	Umstead
Parsons	Robinson, Utah	Spence	Utterback
Patman	Rogers, N. H.	Stack	Vinson, Ga.
Patterson	Romjue	Starnes	Vinson, Ky.
Pearson	Rudd	Steagall	Wallgren
Peterson, Fla.	Ryan	Stubbs	Walter
Peterson, Ga.	Sadowski	Sullivan	Warren
Pettengill	Sanders, Tex.	Sumners, Tex.	Wearin
Peyser	Sandlin	Sutphin	Weaver
Pfeifer	Schulte	Sweeney	Werner
Pierce	Scott	Tarver	West
Polk	Scrugham	Taylor, Colo.	Whelchel
Quinn	Sears	Taylor, S. C.	Whittington
Rabaut	Secrest	Terry	Willcox
Ramsay	Shanley	Thom	Williams
Randolph	Shannon	Thomason	Wilson, La.
Rankin	Sirovich	Thompson	Wood
Rayburn	Sisson	Tolan	Woodrum
Reilly	Smith, Conn.	Tonry	Young
Richards	Smith, Va.	Truax	Zimmerman

NAYS—102

Allen	Ekwall	Kimball	Reed, N. Y.
Amle	Engel	Kinzer	Rich
Andresen	Englebright	Knutson	Robison, Ky.
Andrew, Mass.	Fenerty	Lambertson	Rogers, Mass.
Andrews, N. Y.	Fish	Lehlbach	Sauthoff
Arends	Focht	Lemke	Seger
Bacharach	Gearhart	Lord	Short
Bacon	Gehrmann	Lundeen	Snell
Blackney	Gifford	McLean	Stefan
Boileau	Gilchrist	McLeod	Stewart
Bolton	Goodwin	Maas	Taylor, Tenn.
Burdick	Guyer	Mapes	Thomas
Burnham	Gwynne	Marcantonio	Thurston
Carlson	Halleck	Marshall	Tinkham
Carter	Hancock, N. Y.	Martin, Mass.	Tobey
Christianson	Hartley	May	Treadway
Church	Hess	Merritt, Conn.	Turpin
Cole, N. Y.	Higgins, Conn.	Michener	Wigglesworth
Collins	Hoeppe	Millard	Wilson, Pa.
Crawford	Hoffman	Mott	Withrow
Crowther	Hollister	Perkins	Wolcott
Culkin	Holmes	Pittenger	Wolfenden
Dirksen	Hope	Plumley	Wolverton
Ditter	Hull	Powers	Woodruff
Dondero	Jenkins, Ohio	Reece	
Eaton	Kahn	Reed, Ill.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Kvale

NOT VOTING—53

Adair	Doutrich	Lanham	Schneider
Bankhead	Fulmer	Lucas	Schuetz
Beiter	Gambrell	McDuffie	Smith, W. Va.
Biermann	Gildea	McSwain	Snyder
Brewster	Gray, Ind.	Mead	Somers, N. Y.
Buckbee	Green	Montet	Taber
Buckley, N. Y.	Greenway	Patton	Underwood
Casey	Griswold	Ramspeck	Wadsworth
Cavichia	Hennings	Ransley	Welch
Connery	Jacobsen	Rogers, Okla.	White
Cooper, Ohio	Johnson, Okla.	Russell	Zioncheck
Darrow	Kelly	Sabath	
Dear	Kennedy, Md.	Sanders, La.	
DeRouen	Kennedy, N. Y.	Schaefer	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Mead (for) with Mr. Darrow (against).
 Mr. Hennings (for) with Mr. Wadsworth (against).
 Mr. Biermann (for) with Mr. Cooper of Ohio (against).
 Mr. Kennedy of New York (for) with Mr. Taber (against).
 Mr. Schaefer (for) with Mr. Buckbee (against).
 Mr. Kelly (for) with Mr. Cavichia (against).
 Mr. Somers of New York (for) with Mr. Ransley (against).
 Mr. Montet (for) with Mr. Brewster (against).
 Mr. Gildea (for) with Mr. Doutrich (against).
 Mr. Buckley of New York (for) with Mr. Schneider (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Welch.
 Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Patton.
 Mr. Sabath with Mr. Casey.
 Mr. McSwain with Mr. Lucas.
 Mr. Fulmer with Mr. White.
 Mr. Gray of Indiana with Mr. Beiter.
 Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mrs. Greenway.
 Mr. Green with Mr. Schuetz.
 Mr. Underwood with Mr. Russell.
 Mr. Johnson of Oklahoma with Mr. DeRouen.
 Mr. Lanham with Mr. Adair.
 Mr. Connery with Mr. McDuffie.
 Mr. Griswold with Mr. Dear.
 Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. Zioncheck.
 Mr. Gambrell with Mr. Jacobsen.

Mr. BACHARACH changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, three members of the Appropriations Committee are detained in a hearing: The gentleman from Washington, Mr. ZIONCHECK; the gen-

tleman from Iowa, Mr. JACOBSEN; and the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. JOHNSON.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to was laid on the table.

TAKING THE PROFITS OUT OF WAR AND EQUALIZING THE BURDENS OF WAR

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein a radio speech I made last Saturday evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I insert herewith the following address delivered by me Saturday, February 2, 1935, over the Columbia Broadcasting System, from station WJSV, Washington, D. C., on "Taking the Profits Out of War and Equalizing the Burdens of War", so as to promote the national defense and the peace of the world:

My friends, I wish to thank the Columbia Broadcasting System for this privilege of speaking to you.

As a member of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives, I wish to discuss what I believe to be a great question before the American people, and that is the question of the prevention of profiteering in time of war and of equalizing the burdens of war so as to promote the national defense and the peace of the world. During the past 2 weeks the Committee on Military Affairs has held hearings on this subject and more particularly on the bill introduced by the able and distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. McSWAIN]. The bill provides a plan to mobilize effectively the resources of the Nation for war which will eliminate war profiteering, prevent war-time inflation, and equalize war-time burdens.

The effect of the bill would be to clamp a ceiling down on the existing price structure as of a date named by the President, and unless later adjusted by the President upward no price could rise above the figure at which it stood at the certain named day but all prices would be free to fluctuate below the maximum. This does not mean picking out different commodities and prescribing by statute the prices for which the same may be sold. But it does mean taking the prices of all commodities as they are found and ascertained to prevail in a free market at a fixed date, for example, say, 60 days before the declaration of war, and prescribing that the prices so prevailing shall not be increased, although, of course, they may be decreased. Under the plan the President would have the power to determine, and by proclamation announce, what classes of public service or of dealers or manufacturers of any article or commodity should be required to operate under licenses, to fix the conditions of such licenses, and to grant licenses under such conditions. The President would also have the power to determine the order or priority in which any manufacturer, dealer, or public service should fill orders just as was done by the War Industries Board during the World War.

Under the plan and subject to its specific limitations the Government would manage the management of industry, but the men who in peace time have built and operated industry would continue to do so. There would be no conscriptions of industry, of business, of labor, of agriculture, and no militarization of the Nation's life. The plan is based on the idea voiced by Woodrow Wilson, when he said, "The highest and best form of efficiency is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people."

The plan would meet the situation that President Harding spoke of so feelingly in his inaugural address, when he said, "There is something inherently wrong, something out of accord, with the ideals of representative democracy when one portion of our citizenship turns its activities to private gain amid defensive war while another portion is fighting, sacrificing, or dying for the national defense." We know the whole sordid and regrettable story of profiteering in the past in time of war. In the Constitutional Convention of 1787 there were echoes of the profiteering incident to the Revolutionary War. Madison's Notes of the Debates tell of another distinguished South Carolinian, Mr. Butler, expressing his "dissatisfaction lest the Government should compel payment as well to the blood suckers who had speculated on the distress of others as to those who had fought and bled for their country."

We know of the profiteering at the time of the War between the States and the Spanish-American War. We recall that during the World War prices increased some 285 percent, and that while American soldiers fought and suffered and died in France men here at home became millionaires overnight. Seven thousand "cost plus" war contractors alone piled up their profits and nearly everyone except the man in uniform seemed to get his profits. As the national commander of the American Legion, Mr. Belgrano, said to the committee, if the principles of the McSwain bill had been in the law during the World War, the American Legion would not today be demanding the payment of the adjusted-service certificates.

We must remember that war is not an isolated or separate thing in itself. It is simply a special form of politics. In other words, war is a special form of political action in which the parties to a political controversy resort to force as a means of attaining their

political ends. Wars are largely the products of economic conditions. Germany, with her millions and her great factories and industrial plants, needed domain and markets and expansion and unable to gain this by peaceful means she sought to attain it by force. Japan, with her 70,000,000 people on territory about the size of California, which lacked the natural resources and wealth necessary in her mind for the building of a great nation, unable to take Manchuria with all of its enormous wealth and resources by peaceful means, seizes and conquers it with fire and sword. The nations of Europe today possess 70 percent greater armaments and armies than they did at the outbreak of the World War because of their fear one for the other born of the lessons of history that men and nations do not hesitate to resort to force when they feel that their economic needs demand or justify such recourse. Even our forbears went to war and fought the Indians and took strip after strip of territory until finally they conquered all of the vast domains and riches that stretched to the waters of the Pacific.

However much we may deplore war and work and pray for peace, we know that we cannot control the thought of other nations; we cannot dictate their policies; we cannot shape their designs. We must have some means of defense, and that means should be the product of a well-considered policy of defense. I believe that this policy was best defined by George Washington, the splendor of whose sword and the gold of whose wisdom has been the best palladium of our liberties, when he said that we should maintain a respectably defensive posture, not a posture of offense, nor one of aggression but such a posture of defense as would cause the nations of the world to respect us. Field Marshal von Hindenburg, in his retrospect of the World War, paid a glowing tribute to the efforts of American industry in that conflict.

The adoption of the plan provided in the McSwain bill would add tremendously to the effectiveness of American industry in time of war and would greatly strengthen the defense of the Nation. As Mr. Bernard Baruch, Woodrow Wilson's Chairman of the War Industries Board, during the World War, said to the committee, the efficiency of the combined military and economic machine that could be derived from the plan would constitute this Nation an instrument for war effective beyond the imagination of any military expert even of this advanced date—powerful beyond the possibilities of any antagonist and perhaps of any combination of antagonists. The adoption of the plan would have tremendous influence upon the morale of our soldiers in time of war, for they would know that their countrymen were not profiting by the suffering, the sacrifices, and the danger they were enduring, and they would know that their loved ones at home were not being taken advantage of and exploited in their absence. Napoleon said that in warfare moral force was in proportion to physical force in the ratio of 3 to 1.

Under the plan the cost of war would be reduced by some 50 percent, and since during the World War our Nation paid 42 percent of the cost from current revenues and taxes, this would mean that most of the cost of war would be paid while it was being fought and not be saddled upon generations yet unborn. Under the plan the Nation could pass from a war status back to a peace status with a minimum of the prostrating economic aftermath that has hitherto been the invariable experience of every ex-belligerent in a great war, and that has inevitably led to so many depressions in the world's history.

We of the United States covet no territory; we seek no conquest; we envy no nation on the face of the globe. We have no military aspirations to disturb the peace of the world; but the fact that we were so strengthened by the adoption of the plan would cause other nations to do likewise, and this would go very far toward keeping the peace of the world. The shocking revelations before the Nye committee have shown us the exorbitant profits of the munitions makers, the unconscionable methods used by at least some of them in agitating for and provoking war, and how thousands of dollars were spent by them to bring on the World War. Gen. Hugh Johnson declared before the committee that in spite of these revelations our munitions makers are lily-white compared to the munitions makers of other nations. When the munitions makers can no longer pile up their huge profits, there venal activities will come to an end. The inflation of prices with its pseudo-prosperity has more than once led the rank and file of the people to believe that war brings prosperity and good times; and this belief, whether the people are conscious of it or not, oftentimes causes them to look upon war with a far readier acceptance than its horrors and its losses justify. Too often do we hear it said that if we could have a first-class war we would have a return of prosperity. Today the record shows that no nation wins in any great war. The victor loses just as the vanquished loses. When we take the profit out of war, we at least remove one of the major contributing factors to war and we make one more great stride for peace. The gallant leader who sits in the White House, Franklin D. Roosevelt, has announced his pledge to the proposition to take the profits of war. Under his inspiring leadership we are fighting today to put an end to special privileges and to secure equal rights and a fairer share of God's blessings for all the people. To this great aspiration for the peace-time policies of the Nation, let us, with a prayer in our hearts that we may never have another war, add the resolution that if we must have one there shall be "equal burdens and equal sacrifices for all and special privileges and special profits to none." We must and we shall pass the legislation necessary to this end.

ENLIGHTENED POSITION OF EMPLOYEES OF LABOR

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein a statement pertaining to construction on Federal projects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to call attention of the Members of Congress to the amendment in the Senate to House Joint Resolution 117, suggested by an association of 15,000 employers of labor—National Association of Master Plumbers—as follows:

It is recommended that House Joint Resolution 117 be amended by changing the numbers of sections 6, 7, and 8, to 7, 8, and 9, and insert a new section 6, reading as follows:

"Sec. 6 All construction work or projects undertaken under and by virtue of the authority granted in this joint resolution, in which skilled labor, to the extent of 10 percent or more of the total labor cost of such work or projects is required, shall be performed by contract and awarded to the lowest qualified bidder. The rates of pay specified in such contracts shall be not less than the minima, and the hours of labor not more than the maxima established for private industry in applicable approved codes of fair competition."

These employers of skilled labor, interested primarily in the contract system, have had the courage to take the position that the wages and well-being of those employed by them is a part of their own well-being. It is an attitude which the "new deal" should bring forth from other employers of labor—and worthy of note and commendation, and I, therefore, call attention of this body to the resolution.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein an article regarding pension committees relative to private pension bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

IMPERFORATE, INCOMPLETE, OR SPECIALLY MARKED STAMPS

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 81, a privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 81

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the House of Representatives the following information: The number of sheets of recent commemorative stamps in imperforate form issued since March 4, 1933, and presented to Government officials and all others; the names and addresses of all persons and corporations who have received imperforate stamps and the number of such stamps received by each individual or corporation; and a list of the names of all who were favored with sheets of imperforate stamps even though such sheets have been recalled.

Mr. ROMJUE. Mr. Speaker, the report on this resolution is identical with the report on House Resolution No. 76, which we just disposed of.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, must not a report be read unless unanimous consent is first obtained that it be not read?

The SPEAKER. The report can be read only by unanimous consent. The resolution itself was privileged.

ECONOMIC SECURITY

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means has been conducting hearings on the bill H. R. 4120, the economic security bill, for about 2 weeks. I think now we will be able to close these hearings within the next 2 or 3 days. A few Members of the House have requested

permission to appear before our committee and address the committee on that bill. The committee meets again at 1 o'clock this afternoon and meets also on tomorrow. At these meetings Members of the House, if they so desire, may be heard. Those who are not here this afternoon but who desire to be heard will please give their names sometime this afternoon or evening to the clerk of the committee. After tomorrow there will perhaps not be an opportunity for Members of the House to be heard.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the House of Representatives that we have in the gallery this afternoon—

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that under the rules nobody can be introduced from the galleries.

The SPEAKER. If that is the purpose, the Chair will have to sustain the point of order.

Mr. McLEOD. I just wanted to call attention to the fact of General Booth being in the gallery.

Mr. BACON. It is against the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker.

FORMULATION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, presented a favorable report on House Joint Resolution 148, providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formulation of the Constitution of the United States, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute to make a statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, when roll call no. 14 was had on yesterday, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. DOXEY], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KINZER], and myself were in conference with the Senate conferees on the crop-production loan bill. The need of action on this measure in order to have the loans available at as early a date as possible is very pressing. In view of these circumstances we were meeting while the House was in session and when the roll call was had. Some of these gentlemen have asked that I make this statement to show the reason for their absence on that vote.

CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION

Mr. O'CONNOR, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report for printing in the RECORD:

House Resolution 101

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. J. Res. 94, "Providing for the participation of the United States in the California-Pacific International Exposition", etc. That after general debate which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the joint resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend, with or without instructions.

INVESTIGATION OF CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution No. 94, for the investigation of crime in the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed (1) to investigate all forms of criminal activity in the District of Columbia, the probable causes for the commission of crimes, law enforcement and law-enforcement agencies, and (2) to report to

the House during the present session of the Congress the result of its investigation, together with such recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of such investigation the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses by subpoena and the production of such books, papers, and documents by subpoena duces tecum, and to take such testimony as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member thereof designated by him and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is merely a resolution permitting the District of Columbia Committee to subpoena witnesses?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We on this side will not require any time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution to permit the District of Columbia Committee of the House to subpoena witnesses and to administer oaths. Our standing committees, with the exception of the Committee on Accounts, do not have that power except by special resolution of the House. The District of Columbia Committee, as a whole, or through a special committee, has been investigating crime in the District of Columbia for some time, and they request this power to subpoena witnesses who will not voluntarily appear. They also request the power to administer the oath to these witnesses, and also ask permission to sit during the sessions of the House. The Rules Committee felt that the request in this particular instance was not unreasonable, and that is why the resolution or rule is brought in here at the present time.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri for a question.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the Committee on Accounts be called upon to make a large appropriation to carry out the purposes of this resolution? I do not object to a reasonable amount, but I think the Members should have some idea of how much an investigation is going to cost before asked to vote upon the investigating resolution.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I understand not. The only necessary expenses will be for stenographic services, and an attempt is being made to use the present official stenographers.

Mr. COCHRAN. We had a resolution in here the other day to continue an investigating committee, and they are now coming before the committee to ask for \$100,000. When the House passes a resolution of this character the Committee on Accounts consider it a mandate to appropriate money to carry out the purposes of the resolution. I believe that some discussion should be had on the floor in reference to the amount that the Members think the Committee on Accounts should allow and not leave the matter wide open like this.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] knows that the Rules Committee has no jurisdiction over amounts. If we had in there any such provision, the gentleman from Texas would make a point of order against it under the rules of the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. I fully realize that, but the discussion should lead in that direction. The chairman of the subcommittee is here, and I was wondering if he could tell us something about this situation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I intend to yield to the chairman of the subcommittee for an explanation. First, however, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I may say that 5 minutes is not necessary, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] has fully explained the provisions of the resolution. May I say to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] we do not intend to ask for more than \$2,000 from the

Committee on Accounts, and this for necessary clerical and stenographic hire.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentlewoman from New Jersey is mighty conservative, and there will be no objection from the Committee on Accounts for \$2,000.

Mrs. NORTON. We found it necessary to be conservative, and we felt we would have the sympathy of the House by being very conservative.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I, too, shall not use the entire 5 minutes. May I say that during the fall and early winter there has been brought to the attention of the District of Columbia Committee members the need for a searching investigation of criminal activities in the District of Columbia with a view toward recommendations for remedial legislation at this session of the Congress. I shall not detain the House now to report some loopholes that perhaps exist and the need for strengthening various administrative forces or the need for the actual passage of additional legislation. I know that the District of Columbia Committee and subcommittee charged with the hearings and investigation of criminal activities in the District of Columbia desire but one thing, and that is to make a genuine contribution to the end that the National Capital may be the model city of the country so far as law enforcement is concerned.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of this resolution. Regardless of the investigation, however, may I say that until the Congress changes the present trial-board system, which allows policemen to be tried by their own fellow officers, we will never have law enforcement in the Capital. Some of the most notorious crooks in the country, who have been on the police force, have been tried and acquitted by their fellow officers and some innocent men have been framed and convicted.

Most of the 1,300 policemen here are honorable, high-class men in whom we have absolute confidence, but there are some off-colored men on the force that you cannot get rid of under the present trial-board system, and the system must be changed. If this committee will bring in a bill which will provide an impartial trial board that is not under evil influence, you will have law enforcement in the District.

May I say further that notorious fellows like Capt. Guy Burlingame, who, over his own signature, and his own handwriting, showed himself to be unfit to be on this force, have been acquitted. Notorious crooks like Schenk, who is now serving 20 years in the penitentiary for robbery, have been tried and acquitted in the District by police boards.

If you will take part of the \$2,000 and employ a lawyer like Crandal H. Mackey, who used to be Commonwealth attorney in Virginia, to help you in your hearings, you will get somewhere. It all depends on the kind of lawyer you have helping you develop the evidence. You need one who knows how to develop the testimony and who has enough stamina to go up against the situation. You have a hard proposition to go up against and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] needs help from all of us. If you want to get somewhere, keep the boys in the press gallery out of your hearings. They will hamstring and hamper you; they will get in your way every day so that you will not be able to turn around.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. May I say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that the committee has perfect confidence in the man at the head of the table [Mr. RANDOLPH]. We feel that he is going to give us a very impartial and a very fine hearing.

Mr. BLANTON. I know that. The gentleman from West Virginia knows he has my hand on his back helping him all the time.

Mr. RANDOLPH. May I say to my good friend and adviser, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, that we have before the subcommittee the legislation which the gentleman has drawn up for a civilian trial board, which has much to commend itself to the Membership of the Congress, and we are going to give serious thought to that legislation.

Mr. BLANTON. I am for my friend, and I am going to help him all I can.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN].

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to this investigation; in fact, I am for it, because I am sure that any investigation conducted by the gentlewoman from New Jersey will be thorough and efficient.

However, I wish to call the attention of the House at the outset to the fact that this is the beginning of another orgy of investigations that is going to be proposed in the House at this session. During the last session of Congress the Democratic majority, if you please—and we are the ones who are responsible in this House—carried on investigations, some of which, I think, we will all concede were absolutely worthless, in an amount of money exceeding any investigations that have occurred here in the last 14 years. Therefore, supplementing the remarks of my colleague from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], I think these things should always be considered in the House when they originally rise, because it is incumbent upon the Committee on Accounts, after such investigations have been authorized, to furnish some money to carry them on.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mrs. NORTON. May I say to the gentleman that this is the first investigation that has been authorized by the Committee on the District of Columbia in a great many years.

Mr. WARREN. I am greatly in favor of this one.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND LABOR DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1936

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5255) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes; and pending that, may I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] whether it will be agreeable for the debate to run on today without limitation?

Mr. BACON. That will be entirely satisfactory, I will say to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. OLIVER. The time, of course, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York and myself. I will say to the Members of the House that we are very anxious to allow liberal general debate, since so many have submitted requests for time. We have no desire to cut off general debate since, so far as we can learn, there are no really controversial questions in the pending bill; and, acting on this assumption, we are inclined to be liberal in general debate. If there are any Members on either side of the aisle who know of any controversial questions, I should appreciate it if they would notify the gentleman from New York or myself, so that we may take such matters into account. If we find that considerable time is likely to be devoted to items carried in the bill, we must make allowance for such discussion; otherwise we will give the Members of the House the privilege of longer general debate.

Mr. BACON. I may say to the gentleman that the only controversial question I know of on this side of the aisle is a matter that affects the International Labor Board in Geneva.

Mr. OLIVER. It should not take very long to dispose of that matter.

Mr. BACON. I understand there is only one gentleman who desires to speak upon it.

Mr. KVALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. I yield.

Mr. KVALE. The gentleman does not propose to discuss the general provisions of the bill today?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be without limitation today, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BACON] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 5255, with Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLARD].

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to put in my remarks the resolution of inquiry that I presented this morning, so that the inquiry and the answer of the Postmaster General may appear in the same RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish to the House of Representatives the following information:

1. Whether imperforate, incomplete, or specially marked stamps have, since January 1, 1933, been issued by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing at the request of or with the consent of the Post Office Department or any officer or employee of that Department.

2. Whether imperforate, incomplete, or specially marked stamps, since January 1, 1933, have been knowingly distributed by the Post Office Department, or any officer or employee of that Department, other than through the regular channels of the Post Office Department for sale to the public.

3. Whether any stamps of special issues, since January 1, 1933, have been distributed other than through the usual channels of the Post Office Department for sale to the public.

4. The name or names of officers or employees of the Post Office Department, if any, who have, since January 1, 1933, authorized or consented to the distribution of imperforate, incomplete, or specially marked stamps or have distributed such stamps or any stamps other than through the regular channels of sale to the public, and the name or names of the person or persons to whom such distribution has been made and the price or prices, if any, paid by persons receiving such stamps.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if you will examine the resolution of inquiry which I presented last Monday, and which was before the Post Office Committee this morning, and then read the report of the Third Assistant Postmaster General, you will see that you have never read a more evasive report in your life. He does not answer a single question in my resolution. He does not state how many imperforate stamps have been issued; he does not give the names of the persons to whom they were issued.

Therefore, as I did not get the answers which you and I were entitled to, I have offered a resolution to investigate the whole matter. The committee told me that if I presented a bill, they would give it consideration. I had hoped that the Postmaster General would answer my resolution of inquiry. This is an important subject, my friends, although the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] said that it was picayunish. I understand there were 160 sheets sold, which, at \$20,000 a sheet, would amount to \$3,200,000. I do not regard that as picayunish.

It affects 9,000,000 philatelists in this country.

The gentleman cross-examined me the other day and said, "What do these stamp collectors amount to, anyway?" I might have reminded him that his President and my President and his leader is one of the most prominent philatelists of the country.

I understand that the President has two sheets of these stamps, and the Secretary of the Interior has one, who also is a philatelist.

But, my friends, the Postmaster General does not confine his gifts to philatelists. He gave them to his children. He gave one to Louis Howe, and I never heard of him as a philatelist.

I understand that Gen. Hugh Johnson got a set of them, and that a son of a distinguished Senator of the East—I will not mention his name, because it is a rumor to that effect. Further, a Senator from the West got a set. Mrs. Roosevelt had a set given to her, and I want to know how many of these sets were distributed. Perhaps you think nobody is interested in that, but I do.

Mr. Chairman, on January 25 I introduced a resolution of inquiry which called upon the Postmaster General for information concerning his practice of obtaining from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing imperforate sheets of stamps which he later presented to members of his family, to officials of the Federal Government, and to his friends.

While I was motivated in asking this inquiry by the request which I received from the Westchester County (N. Y.) Chapter of the American Philatelic Society, the questions involved here are so broad that they interest every citizen, whether a stamp collector or not. The real question at issue is not whether certain philatelists or stamp dealers have been injured but whether Mr. Farley or any official of the United States has used his official position to show favors and bestow valuable gifts upon a special group of people.

I think you gentlemen will agree that I have been very temperate in my presentation of this matter to the House. If the Postmaster General or any other official of the Government has used his position to bestow special favors upon his friends, I think we will all agree that it is unethical and improper. I will reserve any expression of opinion whether it is anything more than that when the House is fully informed of the facts and can pass judgment upon the legality of this practice.

The question is not whether there is a law prohibiting a restricted distribution of incompletely manufactured or imperforate stamps but rather a question of whether the Postmaster General has authority under the law to issue or release any stamps for purposes other than strictly postal use. Many lawyers believe that he is only authorized to do those things authority for which is specifically given him in the statutes or the postal regulations. Clearly the Postmaster General's authority in regard to the issuance of postage stamps finds its source in the statutes and is limited to the issuance of stamps for postal purposes. The imperforate sheets under consideration were not released for postal purposes—Mr. Farley has so stated. He stated that they were given to his selected few friends as souvenirs of the occasions. There is nothing in the statutes or the postal regulations which authorizes the Postmaster General to engage in the souvenir-vending business. The United States of America is not in the souvenir business.

Small sheets of 6 and 25 stamps were issued on four occasions, beginning with July 14, 1933. These were not restricted in sale to the Postmaster General's selected friends, and in addition to the 200 and 400 subject sheets. In each instance an inscription on the margin of the small souvenir sheets stated—

Printed * * * under authority of James A. Farley, Postmaster General * * * in compliment to * * *.

In the several official circulars issued to postmasters throughout the country and in the Postal Bulletin the sheets were referred to as souvenir stamps, capable of serving postal duty but issued for the benefit of stamp collectors. No reference is made in the circulars as to the source of the Postmaster General's authority for issuing these souvenir sheets for purposes primarily other than postal uses.

The possible precedent of a somewhat similar sheet in connection with the International Philatelic Exhibition of October 1926 is not comparable with the 1933-34 souvenir sheets, since in the 1926 instance the stamps were fully perforated, gummed, and incapable of being distinguished from identical individual stamps on sale at all post offices.

Since the printing and distribution of the 1933-34 souvenir sheets and the accounting and distribution of them, as well as their sale, entailed an expenditure of Government funds, it might be interesting to obtain an opinion from the Comptroller General as to the propriety of the expenditures made. The fact that the sales may have netted a profit would not affect the legal question involved.

It is a fundamental concept that Government property and governmental facilities are public property and exist for the benefit of the public at large alone. The restricted or monopolistic use of Government property or facilities for private gain is abhorrent to the fundamental concept of popular government.

It is not at this time contended that the Postmaster General or any member of his staff received any private monetary reward for having made it possible for a selected few to obtain the sheets in question, but it is contended that through the exercise of his control of the great institution which has been entrusted to his management he has impressed certain Government property with great and extraordinary value. This property he has made available to the exclusive benefit of a few persons of his own individual selection.

This clearly is an indirect circumvention of that which is fundamental to popular government, namely, special privilege.

I was asked on Monday whether former Postmasters General have autographed sheets of new issues. I understand they have, but never before have the sheets been unfinished or in any way different from stamps which could be purchased from the Philatelic Agency.

Before the committee it was said that I had talked to some collector about these points. I did not talk to a collector of stamps. I talked to the man who was the head of the Philatelic Bureau for 14 years, and he said that no stamps of this character had ever been issued in those 14 years. Once in a while there is a mistake in the machine, as there was in the airplane issue, and all that, but nothing like this has happened in 14 years.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLARD. I would rather proceed at present.

Mr. ARNOLD. I just want to know who the gentleman is who gave the gentleman from New York his information.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Eidlutz.

Mr. ARNOLD. In the Post Office Department?

Mr. MILLARD. He was the head of the Philatelic Bureau for 14 years.

Mr. ARNOLD. Is he there now?

Mr. MILLARD. No.

Mr. ARNOLD. How long has he been out?

Mr. MILLARD. I think 4 or 5 months. That is the information, and the gentleman can send for him and verify it.

The practice of making presentations of these special varieties originated with the present administration. Before this time the Post Office Department and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing have zealously guarded against knowingly issuing any special varieties, and every precaution has been taken to see that no stamps were issued other than the regular common stamps available at the Philatelic Agency and in the post offices to the public.

The Bureau of Engraving and Printing, I find upon careful inquiry, acts merely as a manufacturer executing a contract. The Postmaster General, under the law, requisitions from the Bureau the quantity and type of stamps needed or desired and the Bureau executes the order.

In the case of the imperforate and ungummed stamps the Postmaster General specifically ordered them delivered to him unfinished, or if he did not do so by what authority were they issued. The Bureau of Engraving and Printing is extremely careful in the issuance of all stamps, that they be just as requisitioned and perfect in every way. The Director has no discretion in the matter. He carries out his instructions to the letter. If the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, in furnishing these special stamps to the Postmaster General, acted upon regular requisitions submitted by the Post Office Department in accordance with the established practice, that Bureau is, of course, without blame.

It was of interest to me to learn that the first United States stamps issued in 1847 in 5- and 10-cent denominations were imperforate. These were cut from sheets furnished to the post offices by the postmaster who sold them or by the buyer, depending upon the number purchased. There were also legitimate imperforate sheets of stamps issued by the Post Office Department subsequent to 1917 for use in vending machines. These were placed on sale in sheets of 100 at the Philatelic Agency and at post offices.

When sheets of imperforate Red Cross stamps were accidentally turned out several years ago, the error was discovered before the stamps were offered for sale and all copies were destroyed, the Post Office Department at that time having gone so far as to refuse the request of the Postal Museum for a sheet for its collection.

In 1929 or 1930 a sheet of the Von Steuben stamps, through an oversight, was issued without perforations. The Post Office Department immediately took steps to retrieve it, and three of the four panes were found and destroyed. Later the fourth was purchased in a small Texas city by a minister said to have been Leslie Boone. Mr. Boone realizing its philatelic value, cut the sheet into blocks, which he offered for sale at \$500 each.

In other years and in previous administrations such errors as imperforate sheets have been known to occur by accident, and in that event when discovered they were destroyed before being placed on sale. When errors were not detected, such as in 1917, when the die of a 5-cent stamp was placed in a sheet of 2-cent stamps, or in 1918 when the center of the 24-cent air mail stamp was inverted, the stamps were sold at regular face value before the discovery. These have, of course, attained high value since because of their rarity. A single air mail stamp with the plane printed upside down is known to have brought \$3,200 at auction.

I am told that in Canada a few sheets of 2-cent King Edward stamps were blown out of a window before they were perforated. The Canadian Government promptly made an effort to retrieve them, and upon its failure to do so, issued similar sheets of stamps without perforations.

In 1919 we know of another similar instance. This time imperforate sheets of Bavarian stamps were stolen. To offset their fictitious value the Bavarian Government printed and issued a whole set of imperforate sheets and placed them on public sale.

For some time Russia has issued perforate and imperforate sheets of stamps for the acknowledged purpose of creating a demand for both issues in the philatelic market. This is well known and frankly admitted to increase the sales of stamps to collectors.

How other governments have corrected their stamp abuses and problems is not our concern except insofar as we wish to follow their example. The score of philatelic organizations which have passed resolutions condemning the distribution of imperforate sheets of commemorative stamp issues not available to the general public offer suggestions as to how to right the wrong which they feel has been done them. The first of these resolutions was adapted last July by the Westchester County Chapter and presented at the American Philatelic Society's convention as early as last August. The resolution asked the Post Office Department to discontinue the practice as detrimental to stamp collecting in that rare varieties of United States stamps were being created which would at some future time command exorbitant prices in the stamp market. The fears of the members were justified, for we now know that some of these stamps have already found their way into the hands of dealers and are being offered and sold for tremendous prices. The Norfolk Philatelic Society addressed a letter to President Roosevelt urging him to "Take steps immediately to discontinue this favoritism in the distribution of imperforate stamps"; and prompted by the report that a collector in that locality had a sheet of 200 Mother's Day stamps, which had a face value of \$6, but which he had insured for \$20,000, and for which he had been offered \$30,000 by a New York stamp company. Sometime ago a similar sheet of the Mother's Day stamp was in New York. It bore a signature, "James A. Farley, May 18, 1934", and

like the Norfolk sheet, was said to be insured for \$20,000. The owner and dealer, however, could not come to terms. The first run of these stamps was on April 13, when a considerable ceremony was staged in Washington, with Mrs. Roosevelt representing the mothers of America.

Speaking of the Norfolk sheet, Mr. Farley, in reply to an inquiry by the Herald Tribune, said:

At the time of the Mother's Day stamp issuance I purchased five sheets of the ungummed and imperforate stamps. These sheets went to the President, Mrs. Roosevelt, Secretary Ickes, and Louis McHenry Howe, the President's Secretary. Also I presented one to a friend of mine in Norfolk, Va., and that probably was a mistake.

Mr. Farley further clarified his position by explaining that he mistook a request from Norfolk for an autographed sheet of Mother's Day stamps to be from a personal friend and in sending the sheet used an imperforate one on account of the holes in the perforated sheets catching the point of his pen. After signing the sheet he folded it, placed it in an envelop, and mailed it to Norfolk.

We know, too, that a sheet of Mother's Day stamps bearing the autograph of the Postmaster General was offered for sale for \$20,000 to the Scott Stamp & Coin Co. Also, according to the Philadelphia newspapers, there was a sheet of Mother's Day stamps offered in that city and also in Washington.

As I pointed out last Monday, I am told by Mr. George R. M. Ewing that the New York dealer who received the sheet of Mother's Day stamps twice requested the Post Office Department to send an inspector to see him so that he could tell him the name of the owner offering the sheet for sale, and the Department has not availed itself of the invitation. I have already cited in my previous statement that Mr. Ewing bought a pair of the 2-cent National Parks imperforate stamps for \$250 from a dealer in Philadelphia. I also have a letter written by Eugene Klein in Philadelphia, a dealer, offering for sale another stamp, the 2-cent Grand Canyon, imperforate, pair at \$350, which is a pair from one of the sheets given by the Postmaster General. I also have information, and I do not know whether it is true, that Bernard Gimbel or his representative, Edward Kerr, have some of these imperforate and ungummed stamps in their possession.

I was asked to give the name of the gentleman who wrote the letter giving information, and told that I could not read the letter unless I gave the name. The name is George R. Ewing, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York City, who said that the New York dealer had been offered a sheet of stamps for \$20,000 above referred to.

It took comparatively little effort to ascertain that blocks of stamps which can only have been a part of the incomplete sheets such as were requisitioned by Mr. Farley have found their way into the hands of dealers in several parts of the country and are held for high prices to be sold to persons who can afford to buy.

At the outset only the philatelists viewed the practice of the Postmaster General with alarm, realizing that the stamps would be classed as rarities. When the Mother's Day stamp was run off Mrs. Roosevelt received the first sheet. With the printing of the Wisconsin stamp a press notice indicates that the Postmaster General purchased several sheets, autographed them, and presented them to the President, Mrs. Roosevelt, Colonel Howe, the First Assistant Postmaster General, one for each of his children, and so on. This procedure appears to have been followed with each new issue until the National Parks stamps when the first sheet was presented to the Secretary of the Interior. Mr. Ickes has received one or more complete sets of these stamps. I am reliably informed that he in turn had given away some of his stamps, but that he has recalled them and, if he has not already done so, will turn them over to the President.

I have as yet no definite knowledge of how many of these sheets have been distributed, though the members of the Post Office Committee have shown me the courtesy of letting me see reply furnished by the Postmaster General in response to the resolution of inquiry. I think, however, a fairly accurate estimate would be considerably over 100.

There has been an estimate made of 160. Press reports have criticized the presentation of some of the recent stamps to the President, Mrs. Roosevelt, Secretary Ickes, the children of the Postmaster General, the Secretary to the President, Louis Howe, the First Assistant Postmaster General William W. Howes, the Acting Second Assistant Postmaster General Jesse Donaldson, the Third Assistant Postmaster General Clinton B. Eilenberger, Gen. Hugh Johnson, an unnamed friend of Mr. Farley in Norfolk, Va., and it is rumored that a set went to a Member of the United States Senate and another to a Senator's son.

I was informed yesterday—and I do not know whether it is true or not—that Mr. Ickes gave a set of stamps to a stamp collector in Washington, and that when this resolution of inquiry came along he obtained that set of stamps and has offered to turn over to the President his 20 sheets, but that the President told him to keep it for the present.

That was told to me yesterday. By his own admission Mr. Farley purchased five sheets of Mother's Day stamps. There have been 20 issues of commemorative or special stamps and the estimate of over 100 sheets certainly is not exaggerated.

In commenting to the press on the sheet offered for sale in Norfolk, Mr. Farley prefaced his explanation by saying, "The worst part of it is it was." In other words, Mr. Farley's regard seems to be not that he made valuable gifts but that his friends disposed of the gifts. I have not seen nor have I heard any adequate defense. His attempt as justification of the issuance of autographed imperforate sheets because his pen stuck in the perforations does not vindicate him even in the eyes of those who are endeavoring to shelter him.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLARD. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. How many stamps are a sheet?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Fifty-two to one hundred.

Mr. KNUTSON. If there were 50 to 100, that would be \$35,000 a sheet.

Mr. MILLARD. Yes. One hundred and fifty sheets at \$20,000 would be \$3,000,000.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Do I understand the gentleman to believe that the passage of this resolution will be the first great step to correct the depression in our country?

Mr. MILLARD. It might not stop the depression, but it would stamp out a very bad practice.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The gentleman thinks it is a constructive measure so far as the depression is concerned?

Mr. MILLARD. And I suppose the gentleman from New York, my neighbor, thinks that the Postmaster General has not been unethical.

I do not want to give you the names, but it is rumored—and within 48 hours it will be proved true or untrue—that one set went to a western Member of the United States Senate and another to the son of an eastern Senator, who was a stamp collector.

Suppose if we give the present possessors of the sheets the benefit of the doubt, though we know single imperforate stamps, pairs, blocks, and sheets have more than once been offered for sale at high prices, there is nothing to prevent their heirs or estates after their death from placing them on the market. We know of instances where men have left nothing to their heirs but valuable stamp collections. On the auction block these have created huge fortunes. One of our late colleagues in the House is said to have left a collection of stamps valued at \$1,000,000. Now, if a single sheet of 200 stamps, the face value of which with perforations is worth four to six dollars, is salable unperforated in the philatelic market for \$20,000, a set of the 20 special and commemorative issues is worth \$400,000. I am informed that the President has two such full sets, and Mr. Secretary Ickes had another, and from newspaper reports there are many others. From this it is easy to understand why there has been such a tempest raised among philatelists against this distribution by the Postmaster General.

On February 1 I offered an amendment to the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill which, if it had been adopted, would have specifically prohibited such unusual distributions. Perhaps such unusual distributions are already

illegal, but this amendment would have cleared up any doubt on that question. The amendment, however, became, instead of a question of right and wrong, a partisan matter on the part of the Members on the other side of the aisle and was voted upon as such. It consequently failed of passage. Perhaps some of those on the other side who voted against that amendment feel that no new legislation was necessary to make illegal practices of this character, and if there were Members of the House whose vote on the amendment was influenced by such considerations, I am sure they are taking a keen interest in this discussion.

In my opinion, legislation should be enacted which will settle any doubt as to the legality of such a practice. I hope this House will see fit to pass a bill for this purpose. But consideration of that must come later. We have now to decide a course of action in the present situation. There is incontrovertible evidence that some of these presentation stamps have been placed on the philatelic market for sale. It would seem only common justice, therefore, to the rank and file of the 9,000,000 stamp collectors in the United States that they be given the privilege of purchasing at the philatelic agency similar sheets of incomplete stamps. The Post Office Department should be instructed by the Congress to requisition from the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, if the Postmaster General does not himself take the initiative, an adequate number of these sheets of all issues, place them on sale in the regular way, and thereby correct the injustice already done, whether it was intended or not. The least that could be said in favor of such an authorization would be that the Federal Government would derive a considerable revenue by this course, for a substantial percentage of the stamps so purchased would never be used in the payment of postage. This would give everyone an equal opportunity to purchase similar incomplete sheets, without perforations, and what is of comparable importance, the bottom would drop out of the market, for these presentation sheets will no longer be rarities, or collectors' items commanding a high price, either now or at some future date. Let us see that this unjust practice shall be ended and that in fairness to all concerned these imperforate and ungummed sheets of stamps are issued to the public.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DOBBINS].

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLARD], who just addressed the Committee, stated that the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads had invited such a resolution as he says he has introduced this morning. The gentleman from New York was before our committee this morning and was told that if he wished to introduce legislation for the purpose of ending the practice he condemns the committee would be glad to consider it. He was not asked to nor was it intimated that he should bring in another resolution of inquiry such as was so enthusiastically condemned by the House of Representatives this morning. Such a resolution, of course, has nothing back of it but partisan and political animus. The wording of the resolution alone discloses that. It goes back to the beginning of the present administration and no further. It specifies one particular kind of irregularly printed stamps and no others, notwithstanding the known fact that there have been stamps irregularly printed back as far as the recollection of any of us goes.

They do not like Mr. Farley over on the Republican side of this House. That is all that is back of this resolution. They do not like what he did in June 1932. They do not like what he did in November 1932. They do not like what he did in November 1934. They will like still less what he will do in November 1936. [Applause.] If there were not enough other evidence to keep that aggravating situation constantly before them, the 175 vacant seats on my left afford a sufficiently irritating and constant reminder.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOBBINS. Not just now.

I am not surprised that they do not like him. Goliath did not like David any more, I take it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York and his colleague [Mr. FISH], both of whose resolutions were handled this morning, seem very much concerned about some information they would like to have from the Post Office Department. He would like the assistance of his 434 colleagues to get that information. Our committee's information is that no inquiry has been made of the Post Office Department by any Member of Congress, other than my colleague from Illinois [Mr. ARNOLD], as to the subject covered by this resolution. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLARD] appeared before the committee and made a very fair presentation of his views, I am going to say. He was asked in committee whether he himself, before seeking to enlist the assistance of the House, had sought to obtain this information. He said he believed his secretary had made inquiry on the subject. He was asked what form of inquiry his secretary had made, and the gentleman did not know. Now, is that a sufficient basis to put into action the labors of a committee of the House, and of the Whole House, for the getting of information? Of course it is not. On the other hand, the gentleman's remarks on the floor today and previously, indicate that he has been very busily seeking information from other quarters.

On the 1st day of this month, addressing this House, he presented and read into the Record a letter which, I understood, was from one of his constituents, but which he says now was not. The letter purports to come from one Roberta Roe, and gives some very astounding information. That letter states that one Barney Gimbel, of Philadelphia, was possessed of 10 of these sheets of imperforate stamps, and that the writer would be willing to give \$20,000 for one of the sheets and could make \$100,000 profit on it. In committee this morning we asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLARD] who this lady is. The gentleman said he did not know. We asked if the lady was a constituent, and the gentleman said, "No; she comes from another district."

Mr. MILLARD. From East Orange, N. J.

Mr. DOBBINS. East Orange, N. J. I happen to know more about Roberta Roe than the gentleman himself does, because Roberta Roe, my friend, is a nom de plume or alias or fictitious cognomen used by a convict in East Orange, N. J., a man whose actual name is A. C. Roessler, who is a philatelist—with apologies to actual and honorable philatelists, I use that expression—and who used that fictitious name for the purpose of obtaining from the Post Office Department new issues of stamps after the quota allotted to him under his own name had been exhausted. This A. C. Roessler got stamps, forged a Government postmark on them, advertised and sold them as genuinely postmarked stamps, was indicted on two counts by the Department of Justice, pleaded guilty to each of the indictments, was sentenced to the penitentiary, and in June 1933 was admitted to probation on each of those convictions, and is still under probation because of his admitted violation of the laws of the United States. That is the woman, or the man masquerading under a woman's name, whose letter the gentleman puts before this body as authentic information on what is going on in the Post Office Department. Now, the truth is that Barney Gimbel never got, never had, and does not now have one of these sheets of stamps.

The value of the stamps is put before you in the argument this morning as being up in the millions. As a matter of fact, if my colleague's source of information were really trustworthy, and 150 of those sheets had been put out, their actual value would be \$6 a sheet, or \$900 in all, instead of millions of dollars. That is all the Government could get for the stamps, and any official charging a cent more for them in selling them to the public would be violating the laws of his country.

This valuation put upon the stamps by philatelists is, of course, simply an imaginary value. It is the same type of value that a very low automobile license number has. The man who gets license no. 1 from the secretary of state or from the functionary who corresponds to that State official is glad to get it, but he pays no more for it than I do for my

high number. He could sell it at a considerable profit to another, if it were transferable, but the State would not get any more than the prescribed fee. Nor does the Post Office Department or the United States Government get more than the face value of these stamps when they go into the hands of collectors.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DOBBINS. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Do I understand that it is the gentleman's contention that, on account of the things he has just stated, the Postmaster General did nothing out of the way or nothing wrong in issuing these imperforate and ungummed stamps to his friends? Is that the point of the gentleman's argument?

Mr. DOBBINS. The point of the gentleman's argument is that the attack that is being made from the Republican side, limited in its scope, as this resolution is cleverly limited, is clearly and plainly a mere partisan attack, and should be treated in like vein, and was emphatically treated in like vein this morning.

Mr. MOTT. That does not answer the question I asked the gentleman. Even assuming for the sake of argument that what the gentleman says is true, I am asking the gentleman if he now contends that, on account of the things he has just stated here, there is anything wrong in the action of the Postmaster General?

Mr. DOBBINS. I will say to the gentleman that I do not consent to act as sponsor for any sort of a moral code, and do not intend to do it. I do not intend to pass upon any hypothetical question of morals.

Mr. ROMJUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOBBINS. I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. ROMJUE. I want to make this suggestion: The gentleman from New York fails to go to the department of the Government and try to ascertain what the facts are. He comes in here asking for the passage of this resolution and produces a letter from an ex-convict who has been sentenced to serve time for fraud. He asks the Membership of the House to rely on that when he might have gone to the Department and gotten the information which he wants.

Mr. DOBBINS. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER. I will yield the gentleman from Illinois 5 minutes more.

Mr. DOBBINS. I want to say, in conclusion, that if this resolution had been drawn in sufficient scope, taking in prior administrations and other issues of irregular stamps, it might have received a different treatment. There have been issues of irregular stamps, purposely or accidentally printed, back as far as I can remember.

I can go back 30 years to the time of President McKinley—back to the time of the Buffalo exposition, when we first had stamps in two colors, a colored border with the figure of a buffalo in the center. Some of those stamps were inadvertently printed with the buffalo inverted and afterward were distributed. There was an immediate recognition of their philatelic value, and the then Third Assistant Postmaster General, Edwin C. Madden, caused to be deliberately misprinted in like manner a number of sheets of those Pan-American exposition commemorative stamps, which he distributed among his friends.

I do not recollect that there was any congressional resolution of inquiry on that subject under the existing Republican administration.

The Postmaster General's report for the year ending June 30, 1934, shows that the receipts of the Philatelic Agency of the Post Office Department for that year were \$811,723, as against \$302,619 for the year before. Does this look as though the present method of managing this Department is costing the Government money? There is a clear profit. Those stamps were not used for postage. Here is a clear increase in profit of over \$500,000 in 1 year from the operation of this one branch of the Department alone. I think the philatelists of the country, in the main, concede to the Post Office Department a very efficient management of its stamp service; and I know that those who do not concede it ought to con-

cede it. But we cannot expect such a concession from men masquerading under assumed names and sending stuff here to be injected into the Record, such as this criminal in East Orange who hides behind a woman's skirts.

I shall now leave with the Committee certain observations which I think show as clearly as can be shown that the taking up of the time of the House and of the committee on trivial matters like this is wholly unjustified. When it is pursued to its limit, it is as clear as can be that the very thing they criticize in the present administration comes back like a boomerang to hit them in the face. They criticize Mr. Farley's bookkeeping, yet it is indisputably shown that he is continuing the method of bookkeeping prescribed by the preceding administration.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOBBINS. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. Will the gentleman say whether or not any previous Postmaster General ever claimed that he had balanced the budget in the Post Office Department?

Mr. DOBBINS. Oh, yes; that has been claimed; but the last time that there was even an appearance of a balanced budget in the Post Office Department it was in the last preceding Democratic administration. I do not think anyone dared to make such a claim during the intervening 12 years of administration by the gentleman's party.

Mr. CULKIN. May I say the gentleman is very modest from a partisan standpoint. I venture to say that no previous Postmaster General has made the claim he had balanced the budget.

Mr. DOBBINS. Let me inquire of the gentleman from New York whether he makes that utterance as a question or whether he makes it as a matter of information? If he had read the last report of the Postmaster General, he would realize that it shows the receipts and disbursements of the Department throughout a long period of time, affording a clear and incontrovertible evidence on the question.

Mr. CULKIN. Of course, I yield to the gentleman's superior intelligence.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, another link in the chain of the present administration to destroy American industry was forged on Saturday, February 2. For some time past it has been known that the signing of a treaty between this country and Brazil was imminent. A special delegation of Brazilian officials has been in the United States and has been properly entertained socially by our officials. Sunday's papers reported the consummation of the purpose of this visit. A trade agreement was signed in the presence of the President of the United States by Ambassador Aranha and Secretary of State Hull. Following the ceremonies, Secretary Hull issued a statement.

I call particular attention to the statement from my old associate on the Ways and Means Committee, and my friend, the Secretary of State. I have always admired his power of expression in the English language, so well illustrated by the exuberance of the statement which he issued on Saturday appearing in Sunday morning's papers. It is well worth repeating here. I quote:

I have just had the pleasure of signing a trade agreement between this Government and the United States of Brazil. It is the first one of these agreements to be concluded outside of the one with Cuba, which had special features. I am especially gratified because this marks the first break in the log-jam of international trade created by restrictions such as quotas, import licenses, exchange controls, special arrangements, and almost numberless other throttling devices. Agreements of a similar nature are in the making with 15 other countries, some of them so far advanced that their completion may be expected soon.

Having once started on the road away from the medieval mercantilism which was strangling the commerce of a new world, progress should now be more rapid and the movement gain momentum.

I am confident that in our dealings with other countries we shall encounter the same spirit of reasonableness and cooperation for the general welfare that we have experienced with Brazil, and that soon by the expansion of this program we shall be casting a broad beam of light and hope into the existing economic darkness.

In making public this statement the Secretary of State in his happiest vein uses large words and grand expressions. He is a past master in the art of generalities in the English language. Let me particularly refer to these high-sounding words:

Having once started on the road away from the medieval mercantilism which was strangling the commerce of a new world—

And so forth.

It could be a source of gratification if the Secretary of State, or his professorial advisers, would define in simple English the expression "medieval mercantilism." It would be interesting to know how many citizens of the United States in reading the Secretary's statement would understand the meaning of that language. I assume it refers to conditions under which the American people have done business for a hundred and twenty-five years. It is needless to say that this country has prospered as no other on the face of the globe under the commercial system which has been in force. As the result of world-wide depression, for which this country was in no way responsible, there has been a marked decrease in foreign trade as well as in domestic trade. So this administration uses this decrease in trade as an excuse to overthrow the established methods of carrying on business and the manner in which, under the Constitution, laws have been written for the government of the American people.

If medieval mercantilism means prosperity for the people of the United States, I fail to see why its form should be changed by an unconstitutional, un-American, and unscientific scheme of relations with foreign governments. Aside from having representatives of foreign governments aid in writing, which in itself is entirely repugnant and contrary to the spirit of our institutions, there is another embarrassing feature in connection with the pact agreed upon at the White House last Saturday.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. As I understand it, the Brazilian treaty contemplates reducing the tariff on manganese 50 percent.

Mr. TREADWAY. I may say to the gentleman from Minnesota that the conditions of the treaty are unknown and will be so until they are first announced in Brazil. This agreement must first go to Brazil before we know the conditions or the articles at issue.

Mr. KNUTSON. That is true; but the Sunday papers quoted the treaty as contemplating a reduction of 50 percent in the tariff on manganese.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. KNUTSON. There is no manganese mine in operation in this country today, because we are now importing all our manganese from Russia, India, and other foreign countries. Instead of cutting the tariff they ought to increase it 100 percent, so we can reopen our mines.

Mr. TREADWAY. I can give the gentleman another very illuminating illustration: In the statement issued by the Secretary of State there is glorification over the fact that he would endeavor to persuade the American Congress not to put coffee on the dutiable list. Has anybody ever suggested that we would?

Mr. KNUTSON. I have never heard such a suggestion.

Mr. TREADWAY. Nor have I. That is one of the great concessions the Secretary of State is making to these representatives of Brazil—he is going to endeavor to keep coffee on the free list. We do not grow a pound of coffee in the United States for commercial purposes. Why should we put any duty on it? Why should anybody suggest it?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I understand that the State Department—and, of course, all the news we get comes by way of the grapevine—I understand that the State Department is negotiating a treaty with Denmark which contemplates allowing Denmark to ship butter into this country. Can we not produce our own butter?

Mr. TREADWAY. Well, there are good farmers in Minnesota, and we have good farmers in Massachusetts and New England who would be only too glad of the chance to produce a lot more butter. If such a treaty goes into effect with Denmark, then our farmers have got to compete with Denmark's farmers and our farmers will be put out of business in favor of the industry of Denmark.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the gentleman will let me make this further observation, I think the time has come to bring the tariff to the fore in this country.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am doing my part. If every other Member of Congress would talk about it as much as I, we might be able to do something about it.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS of New York. Is it not true that until the President signs these reciprocal treaties we have no way of ascertaining what the provisions in the treaties are? For instance, I understand that the Brazilian treaty has to be approved by the Brazilian Parliament.

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; I just referred to that. In a moment I shall refer to certain remarks the gentleman from Missouri put in the RECORD the other day.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Is it not true that our country is also contemplating reciprocal-tariff relationships with Switzerland which will entail competition with chemicals and watches?

Mr. TREADWAY. There is no question about that.

Mr. SHORT. And with Italy and Mexico, agreements whereby they will compete with our farmers in the production of tomatoes and corn.

Mr. TREADWAY. It is said the administration is considering another treaty to bring Sumatra tobacco in under conditions which would make it compete with the Massachusetts and Connecticut tobacco growers.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Is it not a fact that there is being shipped into the United States from a large number of foreign countries almost every agricultural product which we produce today in the United States? And is it not a further fact that the wages and standards of living are so low in those foreign countries that the foreign producer is able to raise his product, pay the freight on it to this country, pay the tariff, and even then undersell the American farmers in their own market right at this time?

Mr. TREADWAY. There is no question about the accuracy of the gentleman's statement. The Secretary of State, unfortunately, is convinced that it is the right thing to reduce tariffs; and he is reducing them.

Mr. MOTT. And is the gentleman also aware of the fact that the duty has been taken entirely off hay and straw from Canada and that the Canadians now are shipping hay and straw into the United States, while in Oregon alone, for example, we have a surplus of 45,000 tons of alfalfa hay for which we have been unable as yet to find a market?

Mr. TREADWAY. I should hope that the cattle in Oregon could distinguish between Canadian hay and straw and Oregon alfalfa.

Mr. PIERCE. The Department of Agriculture informed me the other day that a total of 650 tons has come in from Canada.

Mr. TREADWAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PIERCE. And that 2 percent of it was alfalfa.

Mr. MOTT. If the gentleman will yield, the Department of Agriculture has given me different and more recent figures than those. And as to the effect of these importations, I do not agree with what the Department of Agriculture says about the unimportance of the situation. I have received letters and telegrams every day for the past month from the farmers in my own State, and I know what the situation is out there. I may say further that the Department of Agriculture has promised to send a man out into Oregon to

investigate the matter of this surplus, but that it has refused to restore the duty on hay and straw. And may I say also that the 650 tons my colleague mentions includes only Canadian hay and straw importations made by the United States Government itself? The total amount of duty-free hay and straw importations from Canada this winter is to date 32,069 tons, and 10 percent of it was hay. These figures I received today from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. May I suggest to the gentleman from Oregon that the condition which he so graphically describes is not brought about in any sense of the word by the Democratic administration. The Smoot-Hawley bill was the last tariff measure that was placed on the books.

Mr. MOTT. The condition of which I complain was brought about through a Presidential proclamation issued this winter authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury and the Department of Agriculture to take the duty off Canadian hay and straw; and the duty was taken off and is still off by authority of that proclamation.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. That was done under a quarantine situation and under a condition that existed with reference to health.

Mr. MOTT. No; there was no quarantine situation connected with it at all. They are shipping this hay and straw into the drought area as well as into some other parts of the United States from Canada because they can get it cheaper from Canada with the duty removed than they can from Oregon and other States of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. How much was shipped? Let us get down to a bill of particulars instead of dealing with generalities.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, this is all on my time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What is the difference between the exportations and importations in this country today and 4 years ago?

Mr. TREADWAY. Those are details that are very easily obtainable.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That would be an explanation of the situation.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have not at hand those statistics. There have been tremendous decreases both in imports and exports that this country is in no way to blame for.

In the press accounts we are informed that this treaty or agreement will become effective 30 days after its announcement by the President and its ratification by the Congress of Brazil. To my mind, this is the most astonishing thing in the whole proposition, namely, that the Congress of Brazil must ratify the actions of its representatives, where the Congress of the United States has no opportunity to ratify or confirm the acts of its representatives. [Applause.]

When have we reached the point and when has the American Congress reached the point that legislation affecting the industries of this country should be agreed to by representatives of foreign countries and that agreement ratified by the Congress of that foreign country, with the Congress of the United States sitting impotent and having nothing to do with the law?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Does it not go further than that? Is it not a fact that the American people will not even know what is in this treaty?

Mr. TREADWAY. There is no doubt about that. It was signed a star-chamber session, and you cannot find out what items are contained in the agreement.

Mr. SHORT. Is it not this secrecy that has been instilled into the hearts of the American people that is causing such fear as makes business recovery slow?

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is right. An experimental system of laws is destructive of business confidence. It is an entirely new scheme of legislative method.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is it not a fact that when the gentleman's committee is considering a tariff bill the members practically swear themselves to secrecy as to what is done after hearings are held and the committee is in executive session writing the bill?

Mr. TREADWAY. Every schedule is before the committee, and it receives evidence from the people of this country from California to Maine, whereas in this case you do not even know what schedule is under consideration.

Mr. COCHRAN. After you have received the suggestions from the people in the country and have heard business men and their representatives, the committee goes behind closed doors and, unless there is a leak from a member of the committee, nobody knows what is being done.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have been on the Ways and Means Committee for nearly 20 years, and there never has been a time when there was not a bill considered by schedule. That is the way the bill is made up. I will tell the gentleman how these bills are made up.

Mr. COCHRAN. I realize what the gentleman states is true; but what I say is that your committee keeps from the public what is being done after your hearings have been held until you reach a final conclusion.

Mr. TREADWAY. No. Let me tell the gentleman what we do. We report here to the House what we do. That is the way we do business.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is when the committee reach their conclusion. You never report to the House nor does any other committee until you have the bill completed and ready to turn over to the House.

Mr. TREADWAY. We report to this House.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; when the committee reaches a conclusion. I admit that. But when you are writing the bill, you do what the State Department is now doing—work behind closed doors?

Mr. FIESINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FIESINGER. Will the gentleman state to the House whether the Government of Brazil, or the Congress of Brazil, has a law similar to the one we have relating to reciprocal tariffs?

Mr. TREADWAY. I hope they have not. We have a rotten law on our statute books.

Mr. FIESINGER. Was it not approved by the American people when they elected this administration because it appeared in the Democratic platform?

Mr. TREADWAY. No. The people have never approved your reciprocal tariff.

Mr. FIESINGER. We had it in the Democratic platform. We went to the country on that issue.

Mr. TREADWAY. Platforms are mighty handy to get in on. That is all the good that I know of that the Democratic platform did for anybody.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I wonder if the gentleman could enlighten the Committee as to how the tariff policy as carried out by this administration coincides with the tariff situation as laid down in the Democratic platform?

Mr. TREADWAY. I should prefer to tell the gentleman the manner in which the Republicans have retained the tariff law. The gentleman from Missouri was referring to the manner in which the Ways and Means Committee report a bill. I am inclined to think, if the gentleman will give due consideration to the matter, that he will see a marked difference between the way the Ways and Means Committee prepares a bill to submit to this House and the way this reciprocal treaty has been handled by the administration. We do not have the right to write a law.

We submit the bill to Congress, and when the bill is ready it comes here in the open where it can be debated and considered. The people know what its conditions are. The manner in which this Brazilian treaty is handled—and I am told all the others will be handled in the same way—is behind closed doors, and interested parties do not know

whether one article or another is before the committee for change.

To show how completely in the dark our people are when they appear before the committee for reciprocity information, I quote the following from the opening statement of Chairman Page at the hearing on the trade agreement with Cuba on July 23, 1934:

The fact that anyone is admitted to a hearing on any particular item or subject does not necessarily mean that that item or subject will appear in this treaty at all. The treaty cannot and will not be concluded until after the hearings are completed. Naturally, therefore, it is impossible to say what the treaty will finally contain.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman say that when the Ways and Means Committee of the House or the Finance Committee of the Senate takes up a revenue bill or a tariff bill to read it under the 5-minute rule and to prepare the bill that the doors of the committee room are kept open? The gentleman knows that they are closed and have always been closed when you are in executive session writing the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has been so affable in yielding to everybody that I yield him 10 additional minutes.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Just let me take care of this other Democrat first and then I will take on the gentleman.

I will repeat that the manner in which a tariff bill or any other bill is written is for the committee to submit its form to this House for its action and not for an official of the administration to sit behind closed doors with a representative of a foreign country and have such agreement go to a foreign congress for ratification before we even know its contents.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have answered it.

Mr. COCHRAN. I asked whether or not you sat behind closed doors when you are preparing the bill after hearings are over, and the gentleman can answer "yes" or "no", but has not answered the question.

Mr. TREADWAY. I have fully answered the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. In your own way.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I understood the gentleman to say that Republican tariff bills are always wonderfully written and drawn—

Mr. TREADWAY. No; I say that great care and study are given them.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Then I take it that the gentleman is referring to Mr. Grundy, who drafted the last tariff bill that you had.

Mr. TREADWAY. Why, my dear friend [laughter], I am delighted to have you refer to a gentleman who, so far as I know, is simply a figurehead for Democrats to shoot at. He never appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, to my knowledge. I think I may have seen the gentleman in the lobby of a hotel, and when the gentleman refers to a gentleman by the name of Grundy from Pennsylvania writing a tariff bill—

Mr. BULWINKLE. He was a Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is mistaken. Mr. Grundy was not a Senator when the Smoot-Hawley bill passed the House in May 1929. He is just as wrong in his conception of the manner in which a tariff bill is written as my good friend from Missouri has just shown himself to be. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one question?

Mr. BULWINKLE. I want to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts another question.

Mr. TREADWAY. I shall have to yield first to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman from Massachusetts realizes, I believe, that this gentleman was a Senator at that time, and that Mr. Grundy did draw up that bill or did have a great deal to do with it.

Mr. TREADWAY. Not to my knowledge, and I knew what was going on all the time. So far as I know, he had nothing to do with its preparation in the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. When the last Republican tariff bill was brought before the House, could the House amend it?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; if they had complied with the rules. We never put in any such rules as we have been living under the last 2 months.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. But under the rule you brought in at that time you could not amend the bill.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I am sure the gentleman from North Carolina knows that under the Constitution of the United States tariff bills must necessarily originate in the House of Representatives.

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly.

Mr. WOODRUFF. And, as I understand it, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, by the name of Grundy, was not a Member of this House.

Mr. TREADWAY. No; I do not think he was a Member of any body at that time.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for one brief observation?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes; the gentleman is doing such a good job for us I want to continue to yield to him.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I simply want to say to the gentleman from Michigan that he is limited in his information as to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Oh, no.

Mr. FIESINGER and Mr. WOODRUFF rose.

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield first to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FIESINGER. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts was a member of the Ways and Means Committee when the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill was written?

Mr. TREADWAY. I was.

Mr. FIESINGER. Is it not a fact that all of the Democratic members of the committee were kicked out of the committee room while that bill was being written?

Mr. TREADWAY. No; we were too polite to proceed in that manner with our colleagues.

Mr. FIESINGER. And the Republican members wrote that bill behind closed doors?

Mr. TREADWAY. No; let us get the record correct. During the progress of hearing witnesses, and every witness who desired to be heard, from Maine to California, was heard during the weeks and months of hearings, all members of the committee were present. When the final draft of the bill was prepared the majority members sat—

Mr. FIESINGER. In secret conference.

Mr. TREADWAY. In conference, as Democratic members had done previously, and as every House committee has done in the preparation of a bill. Then, in the final analysis of it, all the members of the committee were invited in and voted on the bill before it was ever reported to this branch of the Congress. Now, this is the correct method.

Mr. FIESINGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. KAHN, Mr. WOODRUFF, and Mr. PIERCE rose.

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield first to the gentlewoman from California, and then I must yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mrs. KAHN. I just want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that when the Underwood tariff bill was written the

Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee were excluded from the final writing of the bill?

Mr. TREADWAY. I was not a member of the committee at that time, so I cannot speak accurately, but I do know it was put through under a very bad gag rule. I know about it to that extent.

I now yield to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF].

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] for the splendid explanation he has given to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE] as to where the last tariff bill originated and where and by whom it was written.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, no; I cannot yield again. From the beginning of the effort to set up this form of legislation I have continuously, and perhaps to the extent of making myself a nuisance, called the attention of Congress and the people to the abdication of the constitutional rights of the American Congress and the delegation of its functions and powers to the administrative branch of the Government. That is what I object to. We have laid down, given up, by the Democratic vote, our right to frame legislation, and have turned that function over to the administration.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. No; I cannot yield any more. Congress has no right to delegate en bloc the powers conferred upon it by the Constitution. Today we stand before the American people in the very unfavorable position of having negotiated a trade agreement or treaty intended to violate the laws of this country with respect to the making of tariff laws. That is exactly what it is intended to do. Not only that, but it is announced by the State Department that similar agreements with at least 15 other countries are in contemplation in which the American Congress will have no voice. Possibly they will have to go back to the other countries for their legislative bodies to concur, as with Brazil, but let no one tell me today that he can find out what is in the Brazilian agreement. I have not been able to find out. We know of one article possibly that they are dealing with, which is manganese, and Brazil is getting encouragement that this Congress will not put a duty on coffee. That sort of thing appears in the newspapers, but what definite rights or rates are affected by this we do not know.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I prefer not to. Yesterday I was visited by a representative of the wrapper-tobacco growers of the Connecticut Valley. They are here in behalf of the business of growing wrapper tobacco in the Connecticut Valley on which there is a duty. The Connecticut Valley growth runs through the western end of Massachusetts, in my district, and this was a constituent of mine who was here protesting that in the negotiations with Holland it is probable that the duty on Sumatra tobacco will be lowered. They do not know it to be a fact, they are groping in the dark and have not the slightest knowledge whether that is one of the subjects before the committee, but it is assumed that, as we import tobacco from Holland, that is one of the things the representatives of Holland want to have the duty reduced on.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I shall yield to the gentleman because he represents part of the area I have reference to.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. In view of the well-established policy of the Congress and the administration to aid the farmers, and in view of the fact that tobacco is one of the integral features of farming, does not the gentleman believe that in any trade negotiations the tobacco farmers' interest will be amply safeguarded as they were when we made our treaty with Cuba, which also had something to do with tobacco?

Mr. TREADWAY. No; I have no assurance of any such care being given.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mrs. GREENWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Mrs. GREENWAY. There is no political aspect to this question. I am asking it genuinely for information, because I think it is important to everyone on both sides of the aisle, and I myself am ignorant. I want to ask if the treaty with Brazil under the favored-nation clause gives the same reduced tariffs on certain commodities to other nations, who are not discriminating against us at this time, as well as to Brazil?

Mr. TREADWAY. I must plead ignorance because, of course, we have not seen the agreement drawn with Brazil. They are being negotiated under the act of 1934, known as "reciprocal trade agreements."

Mrs. GREENWAY. Which recognize the favored-nation clause?

Mr. BACON. The testimony before our subcommittee was that the answer to the gentlewoman's question is "yes"; the favored-nation clause does apply.

Mrs. GREENWAY. Then does that mean that certain commodities produced in Brazil, upon which the tariff has been reduced, which are also produced in India and Africa, will be able to come in with the same reduction?

Mr. KNUTSON. If they have a favored-nation treaty.

Mr. TREADWAY. If that is the definition of the favored-nation clause, I think it makes it even worse for the reciprocal tariff agreement.

Mr. KNUTSON. Because it extends it away beyond Brazil.

Mr. TREADWAY. It makes it much more extensive, so that I think it is even worse than to have it with one country only. As this question is of very great importance, I am inserting here the testimony of the representative of the State Department.

The following is an extract from the testimony of Mr. Henry T. Grady, Chief, Tariff Section, Department of State, before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations, December 10, 1934, on the subject of promotion of reciprocal trade agreements:

Mr. BACON. Do these agreements involve changes in the tariffs?

Mr. GRADY. Yes; that is our concession to the other country. It is a reduction in our own rate, within the scope of the act, which is 50-percent maximum.

Mr. BACON. What effect do the most-favored-nation clauses have on these agreements? Are they a stumbling block?

Mr. GRADY. No; I should not say so. We have given a great deal of thought to that problem, and have in mind extending, as the act provides, these concessions to other countries if they are not discriminating against us.

As you recall, the act provides that the President may withhold generalization from countries that are discriminating against us. Some latitude will have to be maintained in deciding what countries will be denied these generalizations, but I should say that those that are flagrantly discriminating against us would certainly not get generalizations of concessions.

Mr. BACON. Would they demand equal treatment under the most-favored-nation clause?

Mr. GRADY. If they have a most-favored-nation arrangement with us, they would undoubtedly get the concession, assuming that they were not violating their most-favored agreement with us.

Mr. BACON. If you made a tariff concession on a given commodity with nation A, could not nation B ask for the same tariff concession?

Mr. GRADY. If they have a most-favored-nation agreement and are granting us the same treatment they are seeking from us, yes.

Mr. BACON. It has been my impression that your most-favored-nation treaty clause is a stumbling block.

Mr. GRADY. If you are a little careful not to extend concessions to country A, unless that country is a principal or important supplier, then you do not have the problem of giving a very important concession to some other country by generalization.

In other words, the key to the situation is careful selection of the commodities.

Mr. McMILLAN. Yes; that would be my view.

Mr. GRADY. But, also, another thing you do is that, where possible, you synchronize agreements where you have several countries more or less equal in importance as suppliers.

Mr. BACON. Perhaps in the future may it not be wise to eliminate the most-favored-nation clause from the treaties?

Mr. GRADY. I think not; because as soon as you deny a generalization you at once in effect discriminate against that country and you invite retaliation; moreover, it slows up the progress of reducing world tariff rates, which is what the act was intended to do, I take it.

There has been discussion in the papers and editorials about difficulty in this connection, but I do not think that the problem is serious. A narrow bargaining attitude would result in padding on the part of other countries in anticipating an agreement with us, and a good deal of ill will would be engendered, because as soon as you make a concession to one country and deny it to another, the latter is immediately at a handicap and will resent it. But if you proceed judiciously in the matter of the selection of your commodities and the grouping of your countries and, finally, use the provision of the act authorizing refusal of generalization to the country discriminating, I think that you will have a logical approach to the problem's solution.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that we have no assurance that the Connecticut tobacco grower is going to be taken care of any better than the Maine potato grower was taken care of in the tariff agreement with Cuba, wherein we reduced the tariff on potatoes from 75 cents to 30 cents a hundred.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is correct. I decline to yield further.

On different occasions the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN] and I have argued on opposite sides of the reciprocal-trade-agreement proposition. I congratulate him on his ability to support his views in behalf of either low tariffs or no tariffs at all. It goes without saying that his viewpoint is in direct contrast to my ideas on the subject. I fail, however, to find in the speeches he has made a specific and definite defense of the principles involved in the reciprocal trade agreement, namely, the withdrawal of the constitutional right of Congress to write the tax legislation of the country. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] last week materially assisted me in maintaining my position. On pages 1394 and 1395 of the RECORD of February 1 appear copies of Executive order under which trade agreements are made and the public notice sent out by the committee for reciprocity information. I commend these two documents to the careful consideration of this House. On perusal and study it will be found that not a single article of import or export is mentioned for consideration by the Board as to possible change in rate. Announcement is made that a trade agreement is under negotiation with Canada. Citizens of Maine may assume that there is in contemplation a change in the tariff on potatoes. As a matter of fact it might be that instead of the rate on potatoes the powers that be intended to reduce the rate on cloth, but each industry would be entirely in the dark. In previous tariff provisions specific schedules have been before the Ways and Means Committee and the pros and cons have been freely discussed. Note the contrast with the star-chamber procedure now in vogue.

The gentleman from Ohio stated that the importer had no opportunity to present his case. If the distinguished supporter of the use of foreign goods in this country will take the pains to peruse the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, he will find that many representatives of importers have appeared before both these committees with the same opportunity to present their pleas as representatives of our producers. This has even gone so far that there has been occasion to decline to hear aliens. The new system gives the representatives of foreign governments greater rights in framing our tariff laws than the Congress of the United States possesses. I submit this thought for your careful consideration. [Applause.]

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] a question. I should like for the gentleman to tell me whether or not he recalls that the Senate of the United States reprimanded a Senator from the gentleman's section of the country for bringing an outsider, a representative of a business organization, into the secret meetings of the Finance Committee of the Senate while it was considering tariff legislation?

Mr. TREADWAY. I am very glad to answer the gentleman's inquiry by asking him one or two questions. In what way would I have the slightest knowledge of senatorial procedure or senatorial methods, or the action or conduct of any Senator? In fact, we are not expected to discuss either their actions or have anything to do with the other branch, and should not refer to any Member as a Senator. The gentleman from Missouri was out of order when he spoke about a Senator.

Mr. COCHRAN. I want to tell the gentleman it was in the open Senate proceedings in the RECORD. The gentleman and every other Member of the House and Senate knows what occurred, as did the general public. The trouble was the meetings were secret, just like the State Department meetings, and the Senator brought an outsider in as an employee of his office.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN].

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, taking into consideration the statements made by my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY], whose district adjoins mine, and who, therefore, is presumably acquainted with the tobacco negotiations with Cuba, I wish to call to his attention that the tobacco growers of my district are pleased with the negotiations that were concluded with Cuba. To my mind, that is the best answer I can give the gentleman.

Mr. KNUTSON. We can tell better in 1936.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Oh, the gentleman is afraid. The gentleman hopes it will be bad some day.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BINDERUP].

Mr. BINDERUP. Mr. Chairman, a great honor has been conferred upon me by this House in extending to me the privilege of coming before you in what should perhaps be considered a little cordial introduction, but adding to this, if I may, that which is far more important, an introduction, or perhaps rather an emphasis, of great paramount questions that are confronting this Congress today as I see them.

I hesitate a moment. My voice startles me as I hear it echo in the Halls of Congress. This anticipated moment seems to bring a fear within my breast that causes me to realize most emphatically that if I am to be a worthy warrior among you, my colleagues, that the first skirmish, the battle of necessity, will be the battle within to conquer fear—yes; that age-old battle, "the conquest of fear."

For some time I have been among you, silently coming and going, taking my seat in this historic Chamber among the rest of you. As I sat on these benches listening with admiration to you, admiring your knowledge and ability to propound and defend questions of vast importance to our great Nation today, I have rejoiced at times when someone from this platform has proclaimed that fundamental, spiritual foundation of all governments, that human rights are prior to property rights, that the duty of the Government is the protection of the worthy weak against the greedy strong. It was for the protection of these principles that governments were instituted among men. When a government fails to recognize these fundamental principles, it is not only the right but the duty of the people to so change the laws or statutes of that government that these rights may be attained. I have at times suffered silently when I have heard men from this platform stress the importance of political partisan politics, emphasizing this destructive theory of loyalty to party as important and to be considered rather than loyalty to the great principles of democracy.

Sometimes a fear has come over me; I have wondered why. Is it because there was being created within me the realization of a great difficulty, associated with the promotion of the principles of true democracy? Is it because I have realized, perhaps more fully since coming to Washington, the obstacles threatening and preventing the fulfillment of the great ideals of justice to the toiling masses? When I realize the magnitude of the great battle ahead, my friends, when I realize the force of the powers combined to interfere in this righteous

cause, I realize more fully my own weakness, the helplessness of one new in the art of legislative warfare.

In my newness I scarcely know how to address you, my colleagues; yes, colleagues on either side of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, all coming from the same plane, only different parts of our great Nation, coming for the same purpose—that of promoting the great principles of democracy, principles of justice. Colleagues, or may I, perhaps, call you partners, partners in the greatest business of the world, partners in government, the greatest government of the world, or more befitting at this time, if I should call you comrades, comrades in the greatest battle that has ever confronted the people of any nation; comrades in the battle to restore the great principles of true democracy.

When President Hoover woefully and rightly warned us in the last days of his administration, when he stated, "Our Nation is facing a crisis more serious than war." And then our great President Roosevelt emphasized this same warning in his speech over the radio from New York City in the early part of his campaign.

President Hoover and President Roosevelt warned us of the great danger that was threatening us. They did not refer to a foreign enemy that was invading our shores; they did not refer to a tangible enemy that would strive to conquer by shot and shell, or gun and sword. No; they referred to an enemy that was much more dangerous, they referred to the invisible enemy of human greed and selfish interests; the enemy within our shores, among our people, an enemy that works in the darkness; that, like a thief at night, hurls upon his victim and stabs a dagger in his back. They referred to the powerful enemy of concentrated wealth in the hands of human greed.

Sometimes when seated alone in my office, when in the companionship of solitude, I have tried to review in a retrospect of past and modern history, trying to plan a remedy, a method of procedure, a plan of attack on this enemy of humanity, human greed and selfishness; trying in a vague hope to peer beyond the wall of unborn time, beyond the mists, the clouds, and the shadows of an unknown future, trying to learn from the chaos and the fiasco of the past of a great but mismanaged Government that we loved long since but lost a while, to learn in some manner a plan that might bring this great Nation back to the high ideals of true democracy. I have tried in vain. I have thought how much better it would be if it really were a foreign enemy that was invading our shores, for then I know there would be a united action in the hearts of the great American people, then I know there would be no longer Republicans and Democrats, no longer partisan political prejudice, the stumbling block in the way of human progress, then I know we would stand shoulder to shoulder, Republicans and Democrats, all alike in defense of our great Nation in distress.

I come to you my colleagues to be numbered with you; I come as a most humble citizen, but clad in the armor of a righteous cause, the cause of humanity, the cause of justice for the toiling masses. I have come not to speak to you of men or individuals, or of the opinions of men, that change and shift like the tides of the ocean; nor have I come before you to speak of the Republican Party, nor the Democratic Party, of political parties or political platforms that rise and fall like bubbles on the water. For, my friends, men and the opinions of men, and political parties and political platforms, are here for just a short time and then fade away into history and, covered by the dust of time, are soon forgotten.

But principles, my friends, my comrades, principles are eternal; they never die, they live on forever; and I have come to you this afternoon to speak to you about the great principle of liberty and justice to the toiling masses, the great producers of wealth, the principles upon which was builded our great democracy. But first, for just a moment that I may have a background, an echo, or a reflex from my remarks; I have come to search for that peculiar spark that is hidden away within the inner regions of that heart and soul of every true American citizen, the spark of patriotism. I have brought with me as my weapon the magic

wand of devotion and sincerity to our great Government that I might fan this spark into a flame that will forever consume all political partisan prejudice, the stumbling block to the righteous solution of national problems; and with this magic wand of devotion and sincerity to our great Government, I may touch once more that magic spot, that there may arise within this Hall of Congress a mighty host of fighting patriots who dare to stand erect and face the enemy of man, the enemy of our great Nation, Wall Street and the international bankers and large organizations and associations of capital. The enemy that President Hoover and President Roosevelt referred to when they said our Nation was facing a crisis more serious than the war; that there may arise before this Congress a mighty host of original thinking patriots that will challenge the enemy of mankind and say you shall not pass, you shall not destroy the great institution of civilization upon the bloodstained altar of human greed, you shall no longer wash that golden calf of mammon in the tears of widows and orphans and suffering humanity, you shall no longer measure the sweat of the brow of man in your goblets of gold. Because, my friends, my colleagues, my comrades, liberty is not safe in the hands of usury, and justice is imperiled in the hands that are skilled in grabbing dollars; because our great Nation cannot live; civilization cannot endure unless the reasonable wants of humanity are satisfied. You can crowd the most peaceful man until he will fight and kill in war, resort to suicide and murder; you can starve the most righteous soul until he will steal; by the power of greed, through the instrumentality of hunger and degradation and starvation, you can warp the brain and sear the conscience and send the soul of the most righteousness man to Hell; by the power of concentrated wealth you are today robbing the laboring man of his home and the farmer of his farm and the Nation of that home, which is the very unit in the foundation of our Government; you are robbing, stealing, and plundering. Yea, you are robbing even the Almighty God of that otherwise righteous soul that sins today only because of poverty.

My friends and colleagues, my partners and comrades, in conclusion may I emphasize or explain that my motive in coming to you was in an effort to cement together the great forces of the individual representatives in the people's Congress, pleading for united action, amplifying the call of our great Nation, for the cooperation of the individual citizen to conquer in the great battle that confronts this the Seventy-fourth Congress—the battle for the preservation of the Constitution of our great Nation, the battle to restore once more the right of the people's Congress to coin all money and regulate the value thereof. There is nothing radical about this plan. I am not radical because I ask the return of this omnipotent power once more to our Congress, but, rather, are those radical that took away from the people this sacred right and privilege—money, that paramount issue, that greatest of all questions that confronts this the Seventy-fourth Congress; money, that measures the sweat of the brow, that measures even the life span of the laboring man who sells his life to his employer by the day, or the month, or the year; money, creator and destroyer of the great institution of civilization, that can build homes and empires when in the magic bond of human love, that can warp and destroy humanity when in the hands of human greed. My friends, let us not deceive ourselves; let us no longer work blindfolded. Like children, we have been groping in the darkness, trying to build prosperity from the top down in place of from the bottom up, forgetting God Almighty's own sacred fountain of all prosperity, which is labor combined with the natural resources of the earth. Groping in darkness we have become lost, and comforted ourselves by saying that prosperity was just around the corner. Becoming disillusioned, refusing to believe this any longer, we begin telling each other, in the theory of Dr. Coué—and, by the way, Dr. Coué died saying these magic words—"Every day, and in every way, I am becoming better and better." My friends, let us not deceive ourselves. And yet let me say nothing that should detract from the noble efforts that have

been made by our administration—efforts to find and bring back the prosperity of our great Nation. Again let me say, let us be honest with ourselves; let us follow the advice of our great leader, President Roosevelt, when he said in the beginning of our experimental stage, admitting that it was experimental, when he said, "If I find I am wrong, I shall be the first to admit it." That was a frank and noble statement. Let us all make that statement, and let us admit that we were wrong at times. May I suggest, let us study the power of money. No power on earth to man for evil or for good can equal the power of money. This drives man forth from his sacred dwelling place into the highways and byways of life, a roaming nomad, a wanderer without a home, while at the same time it builds upon yonder heights a castle to the rich; and in the valleys a church, a cathedral to soothe, to pacify, and comfort a guilty conscience.

No power on earth to man, for evil or for good, can equal the power of money.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GASQUE].

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, I had some information which I thought the Members of this Congress ought to have, due to the fact that about 20 percent of all the bills that have been introduced in Congress have been referred to the committee of which I am chairman. This afternoon I asked unanimous consent to place this information in the RECORD for the benefit of the Members who have introduced these bills. The distinguished leader of the minority objected. Why, I do not know.

Mr. Chairman, I ask now to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein this information in order to let the Members know what this refers to.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] objected because he thought it was an article by some stranger, not a Member of the House.

Mr. GASQUE. If the gentleman will read the RECORD in the morning he will see that I stated this was information from the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BACON. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] misunderstood the gentleman, and I am sure there is no objection.

Mr. GASQUE. I regret that he did. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks by placing this article prepared by the Chairman of the Committee on Pensions in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished Chairman of the Pensions Committee tell the House at this point whether it is his intention to consider private bills in this Congress?

Mr. GASQUE. It is, and that is the purpose of this article which I have prepared. I wanted to give the membership of the House the information and basis upon which we will consider those bills.

Mr. KNUTSON. How many private bills are now before the Committee on Pensions?

Mr. GASQUE. About 1,800 have been introduced at this session.

Mr. KNUTSON. We have not had any private bills in about 2 years.

Mr. GASQUE. Not since the Honorable Mr. Hoover vetoed the last bill we passed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. GASQUE. Mr. Chairman, as Chairman of the Committee on Pensions, I believe that it might be well for me to insert in the RECORD a few remarks for the benefit of the Members of the House showing the problem of the committee with reference to special-act pensions. My remarks will be very general and will follow somewhat in this order:

I. Need for special legislation:

(a) History of special acts.

(b) Creation of committee therefor. Jurisdiction of Congress paramount.

(c) Impossibility of covering all groups and classes or certain individual cases by veterans' acts because of danger of including cases without merit.

II. Problems before committee:

(a) Misunderstanding of need and unnecessary opposition to special acts which are not covered by laws, are meritorious, and cannot be covered by uniform legislation.

(b) Discussion re: need for better selection of cases for bills. Need for having Veterans' Administration deny cases.

(c) Rules of committee being revised to cover proper cases.

III. Need for uniform legislation:

(a) History of action by committee.

First. Widows' uniform pension bill.

Second. Gasque uniform pension bill for all veterans and dependents.

Third. Plans for future.

(b) Results of uniform legislation if enacted.

(c) Uniform law and special acts must go along concurrently, and the latter must round out; that is, complete program of legislation.

IV. Conclusion as to policy of Committee on Pensions.

NEED FOR SPECIAL LEGISLATION

The general principle is broad. It is that when a claim has been filed in the Pension Service and is clearly one of exceptional merit, but where relief cannot be afforded under the law, or under the law as interpreted, there is just ground for a grant of pension by special act of Congress.

The contrary of this is, of course, true; namely, that when a case is not of conceded merit and is not provided for by general legislation, there is a question as to the justice and propriety of a grant of pension by special act of Congress. It is not believed that physical condition or financial need should be the sole basis of allowance, independent of other recognized merit.

(a) The history of special acts, together with a brief study of the problems of special acts for pension purposes reconsidered in connection with recommendations and policies thus far developed, show that the consideration of this problem requires that due weight be given to the principles underlying the present practice of Congress and the principles which may be utilized in argument against the continuation of the practice. Special acts for pension purposes have been passed by Congress over a long period of years, and the practice has become an institution of the Congress. For immediate reference there are listed below the number of special acts for pension purposes approved by the several Congresses since March 4, 1861:

Thirty-seventh (1861-63)	12
Thirty-eighth (1863-65)	27
Thirty-ninth (1865-67)	138
Fortieth (1867-69)	275
Forty-first (1869-71)	85
Forty-second (1871-73)	167
Forty-third (1873-75)	182
Forty-fourth (1875-77)	98
Forty-fifth (1877-79)	230
Forty-sixth (1879-81)	96
Forty-seventh (1881-83)	216
Forty-eighth (1883-85)	598
Forty-ninth (1885-87)	856
Fiftieth (1887-89)	1,015
Fifty-first (1889-91)	1,338
Fifty-second (1891-93)	217
Fifty-third (1893-95)	119
Fifty-fourth (1895-97)	378
Fifty-fifth (1897-99)	694
Fifty-sixth (1899-1901)	1,391
Fifty-seventh (1901-3)	2,171
Fifty-eighth (1903-5)	3,355
Fifty-ninth (1905-7)	6,030
Sixtieth (1907-9)	6,800
Sixty-first (1909-11)	9,649
Sixty-second (1911-13)	6,350
Sixty-third (1913-15)	5,081
Sixty-fourth (1915-17)	5,885
Sixty-fifth (1917-19)	3,641
Sixty-sixth (1919-21)	2,200
Sixty-seventh (1921-23)	2,319
Sixty-eighth (1923-25)	2,436

Sixty-ninth (1925-27).....	5,375
Seventieth (1927-29).....	7,569
Seventh-first (2d sess., 1929-30).....	3,731
Total.....	80,554

Approximately 11,000 persons are now receiving pension by virtue of special acts, as nearly 70,000 persons have died who received their pension by special act in the Thirty-seventh Congress to the Seventy-first Congress, inclusive.

It may be of interest to know some of the reasons for the creation and maintenance of this program of special-act pensions; and from the information obtained from the brief study thus far conducted, it appears that the practice may have resulted from the following conditions:

First. Pension legislation has always taken simplified form, being very much less exhaustive in its provisions than World War legislation. This made it possible for many groups not covered by existing legislation to bring individual cases to the attention of the representatives in Congress upon the assumption that general legislation to cover the particular group was not practical or contemplated.

Second. Special legislation has probably resulted in less annual expenditure than would have been encountered had Congress seen fit to enact exhaustive pension legislation to cover particular groups excluded during prior considerations of desired pension legislation.

Third. The long history of special-act legislation for pension purposes can all be traced back to the basic regulations under which the committees operate, from there to the fundamentals of the organization of the legislative body, and from there to the inadequacy of the pension statutes.

(b) The Pension Committee of the House was created to consider a limited number of special act claims, some of which were necessarily rejected by the pension service for the reason that they were not covered by any existing law, while others were rejected on legal or medical technicalities, which Congress could properly set aside as a matter of equity and justice. It was not the intention to have Congress flooded with private pension bills, but simply to afford a means of relief in cases of exceptional merit. Unfortunately the primary and essential purpose of the committee has been lost sight of and there seems to be a prevalent opinion that it is proper to bring every rejected claim, either for original or increase of pension to the attention of Congress, and in many instances the pension service is being entirely ignored. Congress has retained unto itself its legislative prerogative to pass special act pensions and has not delegated this right to any department.

(c) In legislation for particular groups it is apparent that the legislative policy, with the exception of World War legislation, has been to legislate for particular groups only where it was the obvious intent of Congress to include all the members thereof within its provisions. As to World War legislative policy it seems that the Congress understood that many of those who would be comprehended within the legislation probably should not receive benefits, but in order to take care of members of the group where relief was strongly indicated, it was necessary or expedient to formulate the statute in such legislative language that some cases not otherwise considered for relief could not be excluded. The preponderance of equity in favor of the group to be relieved was believed sufficient to justify the enactment of the law. Undoubtedly the fact that there was no program of special acts extended to World War veterans had a great deal to do with this growth of group legislation for World War veterans to a point where, in the opinion of some persons, it would have been better to have taken care of many of the special cases rather than to legislate for numerous veterans who are not considered entitled to benefits.

PROBLEMS BEFORE COMMITTEE

Past legislative history has pointed out the impossibility of general legislation covering all groups and classes or certain individual cases by veterans' legislation because of including cases without merit. In order that exceptionally meritorious cases may receive favorable action and enable the committee to give attention to bills which are worthy of consideration and at the same time prevent the introduc-

tion of private bills which may not receive favorable consideration, certain broad policies as to the type of cases to receive favorable action should be followed. By way of illustration a few policies are suggested:

First. Cases where disability is shown by service records to have existed prior to enlistment, but where indicated doubt on this point may equitably be resolved in favor of the veteran to such an extent as to justify allowance by special act of Congress.

Second. Cases involving line of duty when record is adverse, but where the equities may justly be held to favor the veteran.

Third. Marriage contracted in good faith. Marriage invalid on account of a previous undissolved marriage of either party, and where a subsequent dissolution of the previous marriage does not under the laws of the State involved make valid the later marriage relation of the veteran on which claim to pension is based.

Fourth. Cases where the evidence filed is insufficient to connect disability or death with the service, but where there are strong indications or presumptions of such connection.

Fifth. In claims under service acts, record of desertion from one service where the veteran had one or more additional honorable services.

As to some of the principles which should govern the action of the committee in denial of right to pension by special act, a few policies are suggested:

First. Special-act pension should not be granted when the service rendered by the veteran was clearly not one recognized as affording basis for title to pension.

Second. Special-act pension on account of war service should not be granted when the veteran had only one service, from which he deserted or was dishonorably discharged.

Third. Special-act pension should not be granted on account of war service when discharge was without honor for such causes as venereal disease, alcoholism, and larceny.

Fourth. Special-act pension should not be granted on account of peace-time service where there is nothing to indicate that the veteran is suffering with any disability of service.

Fifth. There is a question as to the justice of increasing the rate of pension to a widow when she has not reached the age which would entitle her to such increase under the law. This is discriminatory and results in allowances to some, while there are undoubtedly many others equally entitled. If an equitable basis for additional allowance is believed to be shown in numbers of cases, it is undoubtedly true that many more equitable cases are not brought to the attention of the committee, and hence are afforded no such relief. If large numbers of widows are believed to be equitably entitled to additional pension under special-act legislation, it would seem to be just to pass general legislation covering all cases.

(a) Special legislation for World War veterans has been deferred but not obviated by comprehensive legislation for World War veterans. Although the World War Veterans' Act has been amended to comprehend within its terms additional groups as necessity arose, Congress has been petitioned by many World War veterans and their dependents for special acts. Congress has not as yet seen fit to extend the program of special legislation along pension lines to World War veterans. As the years pass by the need for some form of relief along these lines is being urged upon Congress with increased fervor. Two of the reasons why this legislation has not been extended to World War veterans may be:

First. The fact that the World War period is not sufficiently remote to warrant the commencement of this type of program, considering the prior practice of Congress in connection with this type of legislation and the average age of World War veterans.

Second. The World War Veterans' Act and amendments have been predicated upon the principle that all just obligations of the Federal Government toward the World War veteran should be incorporated in legislative language, and, due to the exhaustive provisions of World War legislation, the need for special legislation can be considered as at least deferred.

(b) The legislative policy as indicated for World War veterans has resulted in the invoking of the practice in Congress for granting relief by a special act only where legal technicality or administrative error has worked an injustice. In this manner very few special acts are either necessary or warranted. It is well to indicate here that undoubtedly at the time consideration is given to a program of special acts for World War veterans generally, it will be necessary for the Congress to consider carefully the tremendous load of claims involved, which is far in excess of the potential load which has existed at any other time in American history. This load would also mean necessary anticipation of multiplied expenditure.

(c) Rules of the committee are being revised to cover the proper types of cases which may receive favorable consideration from the committee.

NEED FOR UNIFORM LEGISLATION

Its primary purposes may be expressed as follows:

First. To enact legislation establishing a uniform pension law for veterans for prospective application to apply to all war veterans and dependents alike, together with a uniform and just law for peace-time service.

Second. Modification of veterans' laws now in effect requiring legislation to remove injustices within the ability of the Government to pay and within a proper assumption of Federal responsibility.

Third. To consolidate and simplify the pension laws and laws pertaining to other benefits to veterans by enacting into one act the future policy pertaining to veterans, as well as a protection to those on the rolls at the time of enactment of the proposed act.

Veterans' relief at the present time is provided for under the Economy Act (Public, No. 2, 73d Cong., Mar. 20, 1933), the Independent Offices Appropriation Act (Public, No. 78, 73d Cong., June 16, 1933), the Independent Offices Appropriation Act (Public, No. 141, 73d Cong., Mar. 28, 1934; Public, No. 484, 73d Cong., June 28, 1934), and veterans' regulations promulgated by the President thereunder; in addition, as to those persons entitled to benefits for service prior to the Spanish-American War, the laws applicable to those persons are still in full force and effect.

The veterans and their dependents and even those charged with responsibility for administering veterans' relief or assisting veterans find themselves in a complicated field, a maze of detailed laws and regulations incorporated in various sources which even when found offer little to the lay understanding. Certainly this is not proper legislation, nor is it a proper assumption by Congress of its primary responsibilities. Congress provided in the Economy Act for the continuation of Presidential regulations in effect 2 years from March 20, 1933, these in addition to piecemeal protections legislated for particular groups without regard to uniformity for all veterans.

The veterans' rights must be established by a single act, uniform for all wars, and this action should be taken without delay. While the piecemeal patchwork continues, administrative costs mount, and this purposed uniform act aims at simplicity of administration in addition to equal treatment for all.

The veterans and their dependents, thousands of them absolutely destitute, have suffered untold agony under the economy legislation and veterans' regulations. It is recognized that efforts have been exerted by the President to alleviate this suffering, but his power is limited to the authority contained in the Economy Act, which was enacted within 16 days of the advent of the new administration, and which in important matters was inconsistent with the fundamental principle of uniformity in the administration of veterans' relief and left to the President, with advice of the Veterans' Administration, the stupendous task of establishing a just system of relief within confined authority. There are many provisions greatly desired which cannot and will not be included in veterans' regulations, and the Economy Act of itself restricts the extent of uniformity by defining the veterans it will apply to. Further, sound principles heretofore applied to pensions have been overlooked, with the result

that thousands have been denied benefits and are public charges, some of them having what can be considered a just claim on the Federal Government.

One of the principal reasons for the enactment of legislation during the last session of Congress was to establish uniformity in the administration of veterans' relief, including the elimination of major inequalities under the then existing laws. Although to a considerable extent uniformity has been secured under existing laws and regulations, it relates solely to Spanish-American War, Philippine Insurrection, and Boxer Rebellion, and World War. However, additional inequalities have resulted between these groups; and when other war groups are taken into consideration, disparities are multiplied.

It is evident that instead of addressing itself to fundamental principles of uniformity in the administration of veterans' relief that the attention of Congress was directed primarily to relief of special groups from what they considered drastic results which had ensued or might ensue from the Economy Act. The main objection to the laws prior to the Economy Act was the piecemeal method of legislation and the lack of establishment of a sound and fundamental national policy toward veterans. It is believed that we are not far removed from that status at the present time. It is admitted that a great deal of inequality results from the existing laws and regulations as between World War and Spanish-American War veterans, but it is evident that the only manner in which uniformity and justice in veterans' relief can be realized is by enactment of laws applying to all veterans and including therein such amendments to existing laws as are necessary as will coincide with what is considered a sound program of veterans' relief.

There is no need of exempting or creating special benefits for preferred groups or enacting complicated piecemeal legislation to cover deficiencies under economy legislation. If all of the rights of veterans are placed in a simple basic enactment, applying to all veterans alike and establishing rates calling for disbursement of funds within the ability of the Government to defray the expenses involved, the result will compensate the effort.

(a) For the past 3 years the Pension Committee has conducted an extensive study with reference to uniform pension legislation and the necessity for it.

The bill H. R. 9575, introduced in the Seventy-third Congress, was the result of this study. Other bills such as H. R. 1587, H. R. 1589, in the Seventy-third Congress, together with H. R. 7230, H. R. 4679, and H. R. 2229, in the Seventy-second Congress, will also reveal the results of this study.

In the near future I will introduce a uniform pension bill and strongly commend it to your attention for serious deliberation.

(b) The present organization, regulations, and procedure of the committee, with reference to special-act pensions, cannot be subjected to any sudden fundamental change because of the difference between legislative policy pertaining to pensions and that pertaining to benefits for World War veterans. Uniform legislation would correct this difference.

(c) Congress should, by legislation, establish a better uniformity and make such amendments as will be considered a practical expression of its obligation toward uniformity. Special-act pensions and uniform pensions must go along concurrently and the special-act pensions must round out and complete the program of legislation.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, when the N. R. A. came into existence it was appreciated the costs of every industry in the country would be materially increased if the objects sought were to be achieved. It was evident to Congress and to those who framed the legislation the increased costs would make it increasingly difficult for American industries to compete with foreign manufacturers, notably those of Japan, who would not be obliged to carry these increased charges. The foreign manufacturer would continue to manufacture with his child labor, his almost pauper wage rate, and his very low production costs.

The gap in production costs between the home and the foreign manufacturer would be widened, and in a spirit of justice and fair play it was realized it would be necessary for a readjustment of tariff schedules. Rates which under normal conditions would be adequate would be entirely unequal to the task of saving the home markets from an invasion from abroad of goods produced by child labor and pauper wage rates.

I repeat, such a situation was anticipated, and Congress gave to the President and the N. R. A. authorities the power to increase rates, to change the method of valuation, and, in a word, to do anything which was essential to give American labor and American industries the fullest measure of protection.

Nearly 2 years have elapsed, and it is time we paused to see what the situation is right now. The increased costs of doing business have been realized, and this, of course, has materially reduced the tariff protection which had been enjoyed in the past by American labor and American industries.

Foreign goods are to be seen in the show windows and on the counters of every large department store in increasing quantities. There have been remarkable increases in our imports from Japan. Textile goods of all sorts, jewelry and metal goods, rubber-soled shoes, thermos bottles, toys of all descriptions, tennis rackets and other sporting goods, paper novelties, gloves, flashlights, incandescent lamps, Britany ware, pencils, are pouring into the country. The invasion has only started; and, unless it is promptly checked, we will find a prostrate industry in this country.

We have lost 75 percent of our Philippine textile trade, and we have given no encouragement to the sympathetic islanders who of their own accord sought to give us a better break through the enactment of legislation. We have lost a major part of the textile trade in Cuba, Central America, and South America. These markets could be won back in reciprocal treaties, but there is no indication the textile industry is to be given that paternal care. Goods from American factories with American wage rates and American costs are not going to have much chance to compete abroad with goods produced by Japanese factories paying 22 or 20 cents a day for weavers. It is true in some instances that board is provided also, but rice is what the menu calls for, and you can buy a lot of rice in Japan for a few cents.

The foreign markets for textiles have vanished, and now we are asked to sit supinely by and see the Japanese crowd us out of the benefits of trade with the people of our own country.

We talk of the unemployment problem in this country. We talk of putting people to work. Yet we do nothing while thousands of men and women lose their regular jobs and are forced into breadlines because of the cheaper foreign goods pouring into the United States from Japan.

Protests have come into Washington. Many petitions for increased tariff protection have been filed with the Tariff Commission. But there is no action. The Commission delays and waits for the reciprocal treaties which the State Department is trying to negotiate. Everyone knows there is very little hope in that direction, and everyone knows how eternally slow are the movements of diplomats. Months have already passed and months more will go by with very little progress.

The great menace is Japan, and the leaders of that progressive nation of the Orient, with a full realization of their advantage, are not going to make any treaty which will be to their disadvantage. There is nothing in the Japanese diplomacy of the past to indicate the spirit of sacrifice. That noble and appealing trait is left by the other nations of the world entirely to sentimentalists in the United States.

There is no reason for delay in giving American industries a chance to live. We must act quickly or thousands more men and women are headed for the relief rolls. This serious phase of our economic distress demands immediate attention, or the recovery of the Nation will be retarded, and for many years to come silent, abandoned factories will

mutely and eloquently testify to the stupidity of America in failing to protect its own people.

You might think this is exaggeration. Let me give you some information and figures which will indicate the extent of this Japanese invasion of American markets.

First, I want to tell you the story of the rug factory in the little town of Turner, Maine. For generations in that town the people gained a livelihood through the manufacture of woolen hooked rugs. About 150 people were employed, and the total wages for the week, according to an article in the Lewiston Journal, were in the neighborhood of \$2,000. Pay ranged from \$10 to \$30 a week, and the people were happy and contented. The product was sold by the finest shops and houses in America. These rugs found their usefulness in the homes of many wealthy families. Skilled designers were employed to make the patterns, which cost as much as \$150 apiece for the patterns alone.

The happiness of that little town was soon to be disturbed. One day a group of Japanese landed in America. They were interested in the hooked-rug business. They visited the rug department of Jordan, Marsh & Co. in Boston. The handiwork of the Turner, Maine, folk caught their eyes. Ten special patterns were ordered and shipped to Japan. A few months elapsed and the representative of the Maine factory wondered why he was not receiving any orders from the Boston store. He went investigating and visited the rug department. There, to his amazement, he saw many hooked rugs of the special Turner patterns.

"When did you buy these from us?" asked the manager. "I don't recall making them for you."

"You didn't," was the reply. "They were made in Japan."

"And after our patterns and designs," gasped the manager, as he saw ruin ahead.

"I am afraid so," was the reply, "and we can buy these duty paid and delivered for about half what you make them for."

The marvelous, shrewd imitators from the Orient can make these rugs below the cost of manufacture here, so it is no wonder there is sadness in that little Maine town. They probably can secure a subsistence project, but the people would prefer the old security to be found in the employment in the rug factory.

The story is from Maine, but it is not peculiar to that State. The incident is being repeated in every State of the Union.

A silverware manufacturer from my own district once enjoyed a good business in a silver-plated cigarette tray. The average wage paid on this class of work was 65 cents an hour, and the tray retailed for \$4. It was a luxury item and there were no complaints from the customers. It afforded only a normal profit. The Japanese picked up one of these trays, made an exact duplicate, and put it on the market to be sold at 29 cents. The American tray, of course, was heavier and much better finished. But the Japanese tray was of so close a resemblance it crowded the American tray off the market, and the firm discontinued its manufacture except for some special order.

I have some gingham which have been sent to me. These were made in Japan and delivered to be sold in New York City, duty paid, for 10½ cents a yard. The cost of reproducing these goods with the same fast-colored dyes in the United States would be about 19 cents a yard. This particular item is what is known as a novelty, but the plain goods are in the same jeopardy. Is it any wonder there is hesitation in the gingham markets and buyers hesitate to place the orders which are essential to put people to work at real wages, as desired by the Government?

I have here a letter from a distributor in Pennsylvania. He operates a chain of stores. He handles, he says, many thousands of house bulbs and his competitors sell millions. These bulbs cost about 3¼ cents apiece and sell for 5 to 7 cents. The firm sells bamboo rakes made in Japan, and these rakes are delivered into the warehouse at from 9 to 11 cents. It is not necessary to tell any intelligent American that we cannot maintain the American wage scale and the American standard of living and compete with these prices. But think

of the jobs in America which are being lost because we are not able to manufacture these goods here.

The increasing menace of the Japanese exploitation of the American market is revealed in our own Government import figures. Cotton-cloth imports for 1932 totaled 789,244 square yards. In 11 months in 1934 the imports had grown to 5,076,692 square yards. The imports in 1932 were divided as follows: 455 square yards of unbleached goods; 51,397 square yards of bleached goods; 737,392 yards of printed, dyed, or colored goods. The figures for 11 months of 1934 were: No unbleached goods imported; 4,048,602 square yards of bleached goods; and 1,028,909 square yards of printed, dyed, or colored goods.

The jewelry and allied trades showed a corresponding loss of the home market. Imports classified as decorative metals were \$78,763 in 1932, while in 1934 they had increased to \$456,501. Distinctly jewelry imports were \$19,249, and last year were \$40,799. Rosaries, chaplets, and similar articles were imported to the value of only \$190 in 1932, but last year the imports were \$9,018.

I have not secured the detailed figures of other imports, but have every reason to believe from the information sent to me that a similar situation prevails in every industry upon which the Japanese have concentrated.

Let us glance for a moment at the wages paid skilled workmen in Japan, the wages of the men and women who make the goods which our working people are in competition with. We find for a 10-hour day the average textile worker gets 23½ cents; the worker in the metal trades \$1.45; the glass worker 75 cents; the worker in the match industry 23 cents; the papermaker 40 cents; the shoe worker 65 cents; the tailor 60 cents; the carpenter 65 cents; plasterer 73 cents; masons 87 cents; bricklayers 80 cents; painters 70 cents; bookbinders 69 cents; printers 89 cents; male domestics 24 cents; and female domestics 23 cents. Bear in mind these figures are for daily wages, not hourly.

There are some people who will say an industry that could not successfully compete against these wage scales is an inefficient industry and should be allowed to perish. However, I am sure this is not the viewpoint of the vast majority of the American people. The average American realizes the need of adequate tariff protection to preserve for the American workman a job at American wages. The American people, once they awaken to the present situation, will not tolerate its continuance.

The cry of the hour is for industry to put people to work. The Government pleads for this, to the end it may be relieved of some of the staggering burden of relief. Here is presented an opportunity to contribute to employment. Here is where the Government has a chance to give relief to many people without dipping into the National Treasury. Here is an opportunity to follow up the abolition of child labor and starvation-wage scales in this country by establishing a similar ban on foreign goods that are created through the exploitation of workers in a similar way.

The President and the bureaus directly under his control have sought and obtained the power to give this relief. Hundreds of thousands of people are imploringly seeking his aid. I hope the appeal of these men and women, who want the opportunity to gain a livelihood through honest toil at real wages, will not be in vain, but will be heeded and this threatened disaster averted.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is talking about foreign products. What about foreign human beings? There are in the United States today 20,000,000 alien adults from various foreign countries who are taking jobs away from Americans and half of these aliens are here without authority of law.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Well, they are here; and what is the gentleman proposing to do with them?

Mr. BLANTON. I want to deport them and stop others from coming. Why does not the gentleman help us to pass a measure that will stop all immigration for 10 years and not let another foreigner come into this country until every

American has a job. This is something really constructive, and is far more constructive than to talk about products.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman think we ought to protect our industries here in America?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly; but the main thing is to protect American citizens and keep these foreign "Hauptmanns" from coming here and taking their jobs away from them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORITZ].

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Chairman, I too am a new Member, breaking the ice for the first time. I spoke to many audiences during the campaign, but I must confess that right now I am a little bit shaky, because I feel I am before a group of real distinguished men.

I have listened to your speeches for 30 days and have enjoyed them. I have heard all kinds of speeches—some long, some short, some full of wisdom, and some not so full of wisdom. But we have here TOM BLANTON, and I love to listen to his speeches. He is an honest and courageous man and wants to do what is right with respect to the Treasury and all the branches of our Government.

I have been secretary to the mayor of Pittsburgh, and if TOM BLANTON will take a trip to Pittsburgh he will see what a real mayor can do in eliminating vice and crime. We have in Pittsburgh a city which is indeed free of vice, simply because the mayor is an honest man, understands municipal government, and has an honest superintendent of police. If the policemen fear their superior, they will know that they must either be honest or lose their jobs.

In the different talks we have heard here, we have listened to a great deal about this and that. The President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, I admire a great deal, and I am only in the Halls of Congress because of his popularity. He is trying to do the best he can to give us a new deal, but, my friends, what is the use of refinancing the home of a poor father if you do not give him occupation and the chance to earn some money to keep up his payments?

Our trouble, I believe, is that in spite of our good will none of us knows what to do. We are in a dilemma. Imagine hearing this morning talks about such a picayunish matter as postage stamps. When I was a school teacher some of the lads were collecting stamps, and whether I was right or wrong, I do not know, but I said to them, "Boys, forget all about that and go out and play baseball and do something worth while." And yet, we heard a harangue here about stamps, and we know our good friend, Jim Farley, is too honest to do anything wrong.

Then we hear a great deal about the new deal. I have heard great talks from our mayor about this. Whether he is right or wrong, I do not know; but I do know that history repeats itself and that the art of the Greek cannot be compared with present-day art. I know that at the time of Moses they had a jubilee every 50 years, and they must have had depressions like we have been having, but they not only gave them a new deal but gave them a new deck. In our modern civilization it may be we cannot do this. Surely, there are certain fundamental things we can do.

I was impressed with the speech made some weeks ago on the Republican side by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON]. He mentioned the overprivileged. Possibly, if we followed the ideas of Mayor McNair, of Pittsburgh, about taxing sites of absentee landlords who are having their property improved by the very presence of us Americans and they doing nothing to earn their income. If we could get that income, then, perhaps, we could get out of this depression; because any tax on business is wrong, and we must seek a way of getting revenue without undue hardship on business.

These things, of course, must come gradually. I grant you this, but I believe that if we keep on working we can do it.

I find in our Halls here that the minority party is not composed of the Republicans. The members of the minority party are a few liberals that have the nerve and the courage to speak their convictions, and I believe that in the future, if the conservative Democrats stick with the conservative Republicans, there is sure to be on the other hand a people's party—call it by any name. They may say that our Constitution forbids the collecting of economic rent. We must get over these difficulties in some way. We cannot stop, and fold our arms, and simply say that this cannot be done or that cannot be done. I am not proposing a new party, but I believe we must have liberal views and face the real questions.

Mr. MAVERICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORITZ. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAVERICK. Do you think public ownership of the principal public utilities would help relieve the depression?

Mr. MORITZ. If the gentleman means municipal ownership, I am glad to say that it will help. A municipality makes profits, and these profits are not used to pay out on common stock, but to reduce and amortize the indebtedness. In that way they are able to pay better salaries, reduce the rates, and set up pension systems for their employees.

Mr. MAVERICK. Do you think that political graft would ruin municipal ownership?

Mr. MORITZ. No. The city of Pittsburgh already owns the waterworks, which is, of course, a municipally owned public utility, and there is not one cent of graft, and the water is the best you can procure in any part of the world. Further, I might say that even should there be some graft or inefficiency, nevertheless it would save the taxpayers millions of dollars, compared to what they have to pay now. No political system, with its alleged inefficiency, can waste or graft away as much as has been accomplished by one certain gentleman who previously was in the utilities business.

Mr. MAVERICK. I am afraid the gentleman does not come from a very progressive city. I am also afraid that Mr. Mellon seems to own everything.

Mr. MORITZ. The gentleman speaks much wisdom, but the people are now determined to cut their Mellon. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORITZ. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman is talking along a line with which I sympathize very much. The gentleman spoke about the liberals in the House and the same thing applies to the body at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. MORITZ. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. They are very liberal over there, I think, from my past experience here. Some great man once said, did he not, that the Democratic Party would succeed just as long as it had the courage to be democratic, and as soon as it did not stay democratic it would fall?

Mr. MORITZ. The gentleman is right. I come from the city of Pittsburgh, and at one time, about 5 years ago, I was Republican chairman of a district of 350 votes. There were only 2 Democratic votes in the 350, and now the whole city and county and State have gone Democratic. Why? On account of one man who is trying to help us, Franklin D. Roosevelt. [Applause.] I thank you.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I present to the House a memorial from the State Legislature of Idaho on old-age pensions, which says:

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho (the senate concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States of America to pass at this present session a plain, workable old-age-pension law, to the end that our aged citizens may to a degree have sufficient income that they may spend the remainder of their days in peace and happiness; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed, to immediately forward certified copies of this memorial to the honorable President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress of this State.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. To which old-age-pension plan does the memorial refer?

Mr. WHITE. Both Senate and House of the State of Idaho have gone on record in favor of a workable, practical old-age-pension plan that will afford a sufficient sum to enable the people who have reached the age of retirement to spend the rest of their days in security, peace, and happiness.

Mr. MICHENER. They do not name any specific plan?

Mr. WHITE. No.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN].

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, to those residing in our beloved land, where we are guaranteed under our Constitution life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, our thoughts do not wander to other countries where such conditions are supposed to exist on paper but in reality do not exist.

Those of you who were here remember in 1926 that many complaints were made to the State Department by the press and by American citizens residing in Mexico that owing to the antireligious policy under the leadership of Calles they were denied freedom of worship in Mexico.

Many native-born and naturalized American citizens officiating as clergymen and religious women teachers in the schools were compelled to leave their homes overnight and flee from the country.

Among others was the Reverend Mother Semple, director of the Visitation School in Mexico. Mother Semple was a native of Washington and had taught for many years in the Catholic schools of Mexico City.

At a hearing held before the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House she related the persecution and indignities to which she and others were subjected by the Mexican Government. After many months' discussion Dictator Calles called a truce and the persecution was supposed to be temporarily suspended.

The National Revolutionary Party, in control of the Government of Mexico, however, has never ceased its persecution of Christians of all faiths. American citizens, on account of their religious beliefs, have been outraged and reviled, their homes invaded, their civil rights abridged, and their lives placed in jeopardy. The present Mexican Government is arbitrarily restricting ministers, priests, and rabbis from officiating in some of the States of Mexico.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield.

Mr. FISH. I think that probably I am in sympathy with the gentleman. I have a statement which may be of interest to the gentleman and to the House. It has been reported to me that the Minister of Instruction of Mexico states that he did not believe in the sanctity of private property or in the dictatorship of the proletariat. That is the gentleman in control of public instruction in Mexico who comes out on a communistic platform.

Mr. BOYLAN. My colleague's statement is correct, and I thank him for his timely contribution.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. I do not know whether the gentleman has this statement or not, but if he has not I bring to his attention the fact that when the United States Government recognized Mexico, when Mr. Lansing was Secretary of State, we did it on the express provision that religious worship should be free in Mexico.

Mr. BOYLAN. The gentleman's statement is correct; but, like every other agreement made by Mexico, it was forgotten just as soon as the ink was dry on the paper.

The Mexican Government has renewed its practice to which attention of this Government was called in 1926 of prohibiting of religious instruction to children. The only source of education being the hostile schools teaching socialism and communism.

Mexico has a population of approximately 15,000,000 inhabitants. Over 90 percent of this number are Catholics.

Only 333 priests are allowed by the law of Mexico to minister to the spiritual needs of thirteen and one-half million people—out of the 30 States in the Mexican union. In 14 States not a single priest is allowed to officiate. In 3 States only 2 priests are authorized to care for the spiritual needs of 135,495 to 450,000 people. In Mexico City alone, having a population of one million and one-half, only 35 priests are authorized. In several States local authorities by canceling licenses issued to priests, by expelling them from their parishes, and by refusing to issue licenses, have reduced the number of priests officiating in the States to a number less than that authorized by law. On the slightest pretext and without any reason at all church property has been confiscated without due process of law, and without compensation of any kind being paid the buildings turned over to public use. Private religious schools of every kind have been closed and the teachers forced into exile. The reign of terror instituted by President Calles in 1926 has been carried on relentlessly despite appeals to our Government, made not only by Catholic citizens, but by those of other denominations and those champions of justice attached to no church, asking the Mexican Government to lift its bans against religious intolerance and to extend liberty of worship to its citizens irrespective of creed. Only as late as July 1934 Calles declared:

The revolution is not ended. The eternal enemies lay in ambush planning to nullify the triumphs of the revolution. We must now enter and take possession of the consciences of the children; and of the conscience of the young because they too belong to the revolution.

It is absolutely necessary that we dislodge the enemy from their trench, where the clergy are, and where the conservatives are. I refer to education—I refer to the school. I, therefore, call upon the governors throughout the Republic, to all public authorities, and to our revolutionary elements that we proceed at once to the field of battle, which we must take because children and the young belong to the revolution.

Yet this bloody dictator and his successors have the unspeakable temerity to compare their methods as similar to those used by the immortal Thomas Jefferson decades ago, particularly so when the epitaph on his tombstone selected by himself reads as follows:

Here was buried Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of American Independence, of the statute of Virginia for religious freedom, and father of the University of Virginia.

I take issue with the statement issued recently by the Mexican Ambassador that the Mexican people would resent an investigation by the United States as to the mistreatment of American citizens in his country. The Ambassador well knows that 90 percent of the people of Mexico would welcome a thorough investigation of this kind. It is well known that the Mexican Government virtually confiscates private property, offering to pay in return, in order to conform to the semblance of law, about 20 percent of its real value. From conversation with a prominent American correspondent who has just made a tour of Mexico, I am informed that the country is seething with unrest and that there is no protection of lives and property; that over 5,000 residents of Mexico City, opponents of the present regime, have been kidnaped and murdered; and he further declares that the country is unsafe for American visitors.

How long are we going to sit idly by and permit this country south of the Rio Grande to deny to our citizens residing there the right of protection for their property and to insure for them the exercise of freedom of conscience and religious worship?

In order that the best interests of American citizens be preserved the Congress should at once make an exhaustive study of the entire situation.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. BOYLAN. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that when this gentleman to whom he refers, Mr. Calles, was to be operated on, he went to a Catholic hospital in California, run by the sisters, and the mother superior of that hospital had orders that no one was to be allowed in there without her permission. He went to a hospital of Catholic sisters whom he was trying to throw out of Mexico.

Mr. BOYLAN. That is indicative that deep down in his heart he knew where he would be properly attended, and also perhaps that he had the faith privately, but for public policy and for personal plundering of the treasury of Mexico he professes another policy.

I would wish on the part of the entire American public, of our great secular press, a fuller knowledge of the actual conditions in Mexico. All would then more fully realize that we are pleading not only the cause of the Catholic Church but the cause of human freedom and of human liberty for all the nations of the world.

It should be remembered that there is absolutely no freedom of communication or of speech in Mexico today. The correspondent whom I quoted told me that in order to bring out his data from Mexico he had to have his notes sewed in the lining of his clothes; that every message he sent out, every letter he sent out, was censored by the Mexican officials.

In conclusion, I believe it is part of our duty to investigate and see that the injustices that perpetrated upon our citizens in Mexico are remedied. This is an old story. There is nothing new about it. Every agreement that we have made or attempted to make with Mexico has been entirely disregarded by her officials, many of whom appear to be motivated alone by a desire to get their hands in the public treasury and clean it out, without having any thought for the well-being of the millions of the peons or Indians or other classes of people in that unfortunate country. [Applause.]

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman—

"The time has come", the walrus said,
"To talk of many things:
Of shoes—and ships—and sealing-wax—
Of cabbages—and kings—
And why the sea is boiling hot—
And whether pigs have wings."

I propose to speak of many, many things. At the outset I shall follow my colleague from New York [Mr. BOYLAN] and say a few words about the Mexican situation, and I do so only because I believe to the fullest degree in the freedom of worship for all creeds and all denominations and for every kind of religion. In Mexico it is perfectly evident that in certain Provinces or States all churches have been shut down. Therefore, when an American citizen goes into Mexico and into those States, he is denied the right of freedom of worship; he is denied the right to go to his church and worship according to the dictates of his own conscience. It becomes a matter of concern, therefore, to the American people and our Government to preserve the inalienable rights of American citizens to worship God in any country in the world. There is no denying the situation. Our sister Republic has closed the churches in many of its States, and in others so limited them that there is practically no real freedom of worship. In proof of the pudding the Minister of Instruction, a cabinet officer, having charge of the instruction of the Mexican people, has publicly announced that he does not believe in the sanctity of private property; that he favors a dictatorship of the proletariat, which is nothing more than communism. Naturally we are concerned, for if communism takes root and spreads in our sister Republic, it will affect all American interests in Mexico and soon will affect indirectly our own country.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?
Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman speaks of the communistic utterance of this gentleman. It has been brought out here that they intend to teach socialism in the schools, and they say that the family has no right to the child, that the child belongs to the State.

Mr. FISH. What else can one expect when the public official who is the head of all education in Mexico makes public utterance such as I have quoted? Of course, that is the result, and that will be the kind of teaching that will be the mode compulsory throughout Mexico. Having this in mind, and having investigated the facts, I introduced a resolution the day after Senator BORAH introduced his, in some-

what different form, however, because mine merely expresses the regrets of Congress at the continued religious persecution and the sympathy of the Congress for those deprived of the freedom of worship and requests the President of the United States to protect the rights of American citizens to worship freely in Mexico and in all other nations in the world. I submitted this resolution to every Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House before I introduced it, and they all approved it and backed my suggestion that it should be not only introduced but considered by that committee at an early date.

It is not a partisan measure, but it is far-reaching, and I did not propose, single-handed, to introduce a measure of this kind, not because I lacked the courage but because I happen to belong to the Republican Party, and I did not want any individual to criticize the Republican Party on my account, as I happen to be the ranking member on the Committee on Foreign Affairs on our side of the House. I hope the gentlemen on the other side of the House will help in securing consideration of this resolution on its merits:

Whereas the Mexican Government is pursuing a relentless and ruthless policy of religious repression and persecution and substituting atheism and communism for Christianity; and

Whereas the grievances adverted to are so enormous as to impart to them an international character in redress of which all countries, governments, and creeds are alike interested: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States regrets the continued religious persecution in Mexico and expresses its sympathy for all those who have been deprived of the free exercise of their religious faith, and trusts that the Mexican Government in the interest of justice, tolerance, humanity, and peace will respect the inherent rights of their own citizens and afford an unhampered opportunity to them to observe, practice, and maintain their religious creeds and rites in accordance with the dictates of their own conscience; and be it further

Resolved, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to use his good offices with the Mexican Government and with other nations to permit the fullest freedom of religious worship and to put an end to religious persecution wherever it may exist and to especially protect the rights of American citizens of all creeds and faiths to the freedom of worship in Mexico and in all nations.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. And there is precedent for the action that is suggested by the resolution?

Mr. FISH. There is abundant precedent. I might, just as a matter of interest, state to the House that the second paragraph which I read—

Whereas the grievances adverted to are so enormous as to impart to them an international character in redress of which all countries, governments, and creeds are alike interested—

was taken out of an official letter written by my own grandfather, Hamilton Fish, on a similar occasion when he was Secretary of State of the United States, in 1870. There are ample and abundant precedents for resolutions of this kind. Of course, it depends upon the wording of the resolution. I do not say I would favor the resolution offered in the other body, but I believe this is so worded that we are within our rights and would be taking a proper and appropriate step.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. Daniel Webster, in 1823, set the first precedent on that, when the Turks were persecuting the Greeks.

Mr. FISH. Yes; the freedom of the Greeks, over a hundred years ago; but there are innumerable cases. There are the ones dealing with Rumania, Spain, and other nations, written by our Secretaries of State in the past.

I realize it is a complicated problem, but I believe a great country such as ours, a country wherein religion plays such an important part, although we believe in the separation of state and church, we maintain religious faith, belief in God, and freedom of worship, and should take some appropriate action. Religion has always been one of the most important factors in our Nation, in the making of our Nation, and it still is today. It is perfectly proper that we should publicly state that we still believe in freedom of worship, and that we believe religion is the greatest moral force in the world.

When you try to strike it down, you are trying to strike down the very foundation stones of all civilization and of our own Government.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER. I am very much impressed with the last statement of the gentleman, emphasizing the importance to a nation of belief in God and the benign influence of religion on the life of its people, and I think the House gives very full approval to that sentiment. There was inserted in yesterday's RECORD by Hon. JOSEPH B. SHANNON a speech that he recently made on the same subject, in which he links religion and patriotism, and I invite the gentleman's attention to it. It is very timely.

Mr. FISH. I had not proposed to speak on this issue this afternoon until the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN] raised it, but I do believe that we should give consideration to it; and I hope the Democratic side, being in the majority and having the responsibility, will provide for a hearing on this resolution and on all others that affect the same situation in the very near future. We will present ample facts to support our contention and to disprove the statement made by Mexican authorities that there is no religious persecution in Mexico today.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. We have ample proof of that, of course, as the gentleman from New York knows, in the killings, the absolute disregard for all religions—Baptists, Methodists, Episcopalians, Catholics, and Jews—who are not allowed at all to practice their religion in Mexico. Their property is confiscated and American citizens are not allowed to practice their religion. But we certainly have the right to step in in Mexico, since we recognized their Government on the express condition that freedom of worship must be permitted in Mexico, and they have broken that contract with the United States Government; and certainly we would have the right, if necessary, to withdraw our diplomatic representation there.

Mr. FISH. Yes. We have also the right to protect our own citizens in freedom of worship, even without any special treaty to that effect. I think it would be a very good idea, in order to get first-hand information, for the committee, when it holds its hearings, to call back the American Ambassador to Mexico to testify before the committee so we may have all the facts presented.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I agree with everything the gentleman has said. I should like to ask with what grace can we complain of this matter with regard to Mexico when we recognized Russia, which practices all these practices as one of the cardinal principles of its government?

Mr. FISH. I think the gentleman has asked me a very embarrassing question. [Laughter.] The gentleman well knows I was opposed to the recognition of Soviet Russia. I believe that to be one of the most gigantic hoaxes perpetrated upon the American people. A host of radical professors seduced the business men of America and the cotton growers of the South by telling them that if we recognized Soviet Russia we would do \$1,000,000,000 worth of business with them right away. The religious element of the South, the Methodists and Baptists down there, had no use whatever for Soviet Russia, and they were not inclined to recognize the Communists at all. They were against it; but when these able communistic "brain trust" advocates held out this juicy bait in the way of trade, it was too much in those Southern States where cotton is king. Russia was to buy \$200,000,000 worth of cotton right away. The capitalists of the North were promised other business and likewise fell in line and got on board of the bandwagon. Together with the capitalists' support of the North and the cotton-growing element of the South, recognition was rushed through or put over on the American people.

Let me tell you just how it was rushed through. A year and a half ago, on November 16, 1933, Mr. Litvinoff gave out

a statement including certain promises and pledges; and the one that was featured at the head of every paper, the one which had the main effect on public opinion, was that Soviet Russia had made tremendous concessions to religion; in order to mollify the religious-minded people of America the administration claimed that he had given the pledge that religious liberty and freedom of worship were to be granted and that the laws were to be changed. No sooner had he gotten out of this country and over to Germany than he repudiated every word of it. There has not been a single change or concession of any kind so far as religious practice in Russia is concerned. A great authority on religion, the Pope himself, within 2 weeks after the Litvinoff statement was made, pointed out the utter falsity of such a statement in a public release that was published all over the world. It was held out only as bait to the religious people at that time; but I can show you, from the words of Litvinoff himself, from the words of the Pope, and everybody else who has studied the situation, that no concession whatever has been made in respect to freedom of worship in Soviet Russia.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER. My recollection is that the understanding and guaranty were that Americans who traveled or lived in Russia would be guaranteed religious liberty and the right to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. I felt that the gentleman wanted to be accurate in his reference.

Mr. FISH. I do; and the gentleman is correct to this extent, but not a single law or regulation was changed, or anything of the kind. It was, however, held out in the headlines of every paper the day recognition was brought about that there were to be these concessions, yet there have been none whatever.

This is why I say recognition was a hoax; and as far as cotton sales are concerned, while I am not up-to-date on it, the last time I looked into it Russia had bought \$3,000,000 worth of cotton from America and it borrowed this \$3,000,000 from the R. F. C. with which to buy the cotton. That was the situation 3 or 4 months ago. It may have changed by a few thousand dollars since that time. This is just one example as to how this thing was put over on the American people.

Again, promises were made that there would be no propaganda from the Communist International, with headquarters in Moscow, to interfere with our own domestic institutions or form of government, and so on. That was a definite pledge. Anyone who knows anything about it, however, knows this pledge has not been kept and was never meant to be kept. Ask Mr. Green, of the American Federation of Labor. He has made a long detailed statement about the continued propaganda emanating from Moscow. The Communist International of Moscow is operating just the way it did before. The American Communist Party is nothing but a section of the Communist International, taking its orders from it and not denying it. The Daily Worker, the Communist daily paper in New York, with a circulation of 50,000 or 60,000, carries on its front page every day the statement that it is the organ of the Communist International. Not one of the pledges has been kept.

Again, it was held out that the Soviet Government of Russia would restore the property of American citizens confiscated and seized by the Communists, or, if it did not restore the property, that it would make suitable payment for it. This pledge, too, has been repudiated. All these plums were held out to us at that time as bait. We fell for it and now we are in the trap. The question is how to get out of it.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. When the gentleman says, "We fell for the trap"—

Mr. FISH. Not I; no.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. What does he mean; does he mean the Congress or the President?

Mr. FISH. I mean the President and the Secretary of State and the cotton growers and the representatives of the cotton States and some of the capitalists up North and their representatives; greedy, selfish interests which hoped to make an almighty dollar out of Soviet Russia, regardless of anything else.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. I ask the gentleman from New York if it is not a fact that the Congress of the United States had nothing to do with the recognition of Russia when she was recognized in 1933?

Mr. FISH. Not one thing.

Mr. FIESINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. FIESINGER. Did I understand the gentleman from New York to say that the promoter of all this iniquity was Mr. Smith Brookhart, a former Republican?

Mr. FISH. I said that Mr. Smith Brookhart, who held an office at that time in the Democratic administration by appointment after he had been defeated by the Republicans, was one of the instigators; but there are many others. The gentleman probably has heard of Mr. Rexford Guy Tugwell and about 20 other members of the "brain trust" here who were the main instigators and who urged the recognition of Soviet Russia in season and out of season until they completely deceived the American people.

And again let me say the proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof, and we have received nothing whatever out of it.

Mr. FIESINGER. Did not the United States Chamber of Commerce have something to do with that proposition?

Mr. FISH. No. I think the United States Chamber of Commerce opposed recognition, but, may I say to the gentleman, there were many capitalists and bankers, particularly in the East, who were in favor of recognition. Lenin said that capitalists would commit suicide for temporary profit. We have a lot of that kind in our own country, Democrats and Republicans alike, who would sacrifice anything for greed and selfish interests.

Mr. FIESINGER. The gentleman is not blaming the Democratic Party?

Mr. FISH. Yes. I am blaming the Democratic Party absolutely. It had the authority and responsibility, and it did the recognizing.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Is it not a fact that the recognizing could not have been effected except through the President of the United States?

Mr. FISH. Why, he is the one who did it and is entirely responsible.

Mr. MILLARD. He is a Democrat?

Mr. FISH. He is a "new dealer." He is not a Jeffersonian Democrat; but that is a Democratic problem, not mine.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield? I have a very important question.

Mr. FISH. No. I refuse to yield to the gentleman. I am going to talk on Mr. Farley soon, and then the gentleman may ask me some questions.

Mr. BLANTON. It would make the gentleman's speech awfully interesting, adversely.

Mr. FISH. No. The gentleman is apt to throw a monkey wrench in my speech, and I will give him an opportunity later on.

Mr. CITRON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. CITRON. I should like to ask the gentleman a question about this resolution. In line 7, page 2, the gentleman mentions, "And with other nations besides the Mexican Government." To what nations does the gentleman refer?

Mr. FISH. That would include, of course, Soviet Russia.

Mr. CITRON. Would that include Hitler's Germany? The reason I ask the question is that the gentleman has refused to mention Hitler Germany in a resolution of this sort.

Mr. FISH. If the gentleman had been here longer, he would have known that I introduced a resolution in the last

Congress on that particular subject. I have no sympathy with the persecution of Jews or anyone else. This, however, is a different matter. I did not know that the Hitler government interfered so much in Germany with religious worship. I thought it was more of an economic and civic proposition so far as the Jews were concerned. I have no more brief for Hitlerism and fascism of the right than I have for socialism and communism of the left.

Mr. CITRON. Has the gentleman read a statement in the paper that the Hitler government is trying to do away with Christianity?

Mr. FISH. No; I have not seen any such article, and I doubt if the German people have any intention of doing away with Christianity or religion.

Mr. CITRON. I mean the Hitler government.

Mr. FISH. No. I have seen no such statement.

Mr. Chairman, the majority party today saw fit to table the resolution of my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLARD] asking for certain very appropriate information that he as a Member of the House is entitled to, which the House itself is entitled to, and which the American people are entitled to, mere facts, as to how many of these ungummed and imperforate stamps have been given out, to whom they had been given, and questions of that kind. Apparently it is claimed by the majority that it is necessary to call up the Postmaster General or some department if a Member of the House wants to secure information.

Mr. Chairman, a Member of Congress stands on his own feet and on his own rights. In this particular case the charges were not originated by my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLARD]. The charges were made in the press of the United States, from one end of the country to the other, that the Postmaster General had given to a favored list these imperforate and ungummed stamps. Automatically these stamps have enriched public officials, not by a few hundred dollars, not by a few thousand dollars, but by tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars. This is no trifling, petty, or picayunish issue. I do not blame the Democratic Party for trying to cover it up. I do not blame the Democratic Party for trying to hush it up, to put the snuffer on it, and to cover it up. I do not blame the Postmaster General for refusing to answer or for evading the issue, for refusing to give information or even to appear before a committee of the House—the Post Office Committee—this morning when it held secret, executive, and star-chamber sessions.

Mr. DOBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I will in a minute. The Post Office Committee held an executive committee meeting and asked into that meeting the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLARD] and myself, but I was asked in 5 or 10 minutes before it adjourned, and when I got there the committee had adjourned.

The House has had nothing before it in the way of an answer from the Post Office Department, except a meaningless letter, which you on both sides heard read today from the desk. This letter answered nothing. It was a mere camouflage, a smoke screen, a red herring to distract public attention, and it evaded every question asked by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLARD] and myself.

Mr. DOBBINS. Does not the gentleman know he was invited before that committee at the same time as his colleague from New York was invited? The gentleman from New York appeared before the committee and was there for approximately 20 minutes, and the committee was in session for 15 minutes after that.

Mr. FISH. What time was my colleague invited?

Mr. DOBBINS. I do not know.

Mr. FISH. He was invited at 11 o'clock. My invitation came at 20 minutes past 11, when the committee had adjourned. Now, I do not want to quibble about that matter.

The gentleman made a very fair statement. I want to congratulate him for the statement. It was not only fair, but it was clever, because the gentleman has no case whatever, but he did try to make a bad cause look plausible. I was very favorably impressed with the way the gentleman

covered up the whole situation and said absolutely nothing. There is no defense, and I would like to explain why there is no defense.

Mr. BLANTON. Because there is no offense.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman is out of order.

Mr. DOBBINS. The gentleman from New York knew very well that our committee would consider this matter this morning, did he not?

Mr. FISH. I certainly did, but in executive session.

Mr. DOBBINS. Was the gentleman in his office when the message was sent him at 11 o'clock this morning inviting the gentleman to appear before our committee?

Mr. FISH. I told the committee what time I got the message 20 minutes after 11.

Mr. DOBBINS. Did the gentleman inquire of the Postmaster General for the information sought by his resolution before attempting to invoke the activities of the House in the matter?

Mr. FISH. The gentleman places a great deal of importance on the fact of whether an individual Member of the House had asked the Postmaster General personally, or his Third Assistant personally, about the facts. The gentleman knows the rights of individual Members of the House. I have told the gentleman this exposure was not brought up by any Republican, it was spread broadcast in the press. We did not raise the issue, but after it was raised by representatives of 10,000,000 stamp collectors in the United States, we had a right and a duty to get the facts. They are the interested parties and it was then that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLARD], reading the charges in the press, raised the issue and put in a very proper resolution asking for information. I am glad that he did not go to the Postmaster General. He does not have to call on anybody. He has asked for the information in the proper and orderly way and, in fact, in the customary manner. A Member of Congress is not an errand boy that must chase after information from the departments of the Government. Furthermore, what chance would a Republican Member have to get real information except by a resolution of inquiry.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from New York 10 additional minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman now yield?

Mr. FISH. No; I cannot yield now. I hope to get some more time; and if so, will yield to the gentleman later.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON], after I got through the other day, attacked me and tried to do the usual thing and make out that this was small, petty, picayune stuff and just chicken feed. The facts are, and have never been denied, that public officials—not private citizens—not like the Teapot Dome which you tried to smear the Republican Party with for so many years because of certain leases made to private individuals who then enriched themselves, but in this case it is much worse, because public officials have been enriched by thousands and tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars; not through any work on their part, but because these ungummed and imperforate stamps, as soon as they were given to these officials, increased, not 100 percent but 100 times or 200 times their value.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Not now. If I get more time, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Does not the gentleman think we can get it back through the income tax?

Mr. FISH. You have no defense whatever for this unethical and sordid action. It is like a dead mackerel in the moonlight; it stinks and shines and shines and stinks to high heaven. [Laughter.]

You cannot get away with it by simply using your majority vote in star-chamber proceedings and trying to hush it all up. You want the people to believe that a majority vote can turn a dishonest act of this kind into an honest one.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman has mentioned me by name.

Mr. FISH. No; not now. I am going to mention the gentleman again, too.

This, of course, is the usual partisan procedure, to minimize and belittle any dishonest act by the majority party instead of saying, "Let no guilty man escape", the way Calvin Coolidge did in the Teapot Dome scandal. You people, by a majority vote in your committee and by your entire Democratic vote here in the House, want to cover it all up and to shield the Postmaster General and all others who are involved.

Mr. VINSON of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, so that I may get a little information?

Mr. FISH. Let me proceed a little further, and then I shall yield to the gentleman.

There is nothing new about this. This is an old scandal. It has been practiced in the past by South American countries.

They used to issue stamps of this kind, ungummed and imperforate, under their old dictatorships and give them out to their favorites and enriched their favorites to such an extent that stamp collectors, getting wise to their game, refused to buy them any more and so they had to stop it.

This administration—I will not say administration, but the Post Office Department—has issued 20 stamps since March 4, 1933, and the Postmaster General has given them out to the favored few. We do not know, however, how few or how many, and that is what we want to find out. We want to know whether it involves \$3,000,000 or twice that amount. We know to whom they have been given so far—to the President of the United States and to Cabinet officers and to the Secretaries to the President and to members of the family of Cabinet officers and to business men. We do not know how many have been given out. This is what we are trying to find out and this is what 10,000,000 stamp collectors in the United States, both Republicans and Democrats, are trying to find out. They propose to get this information, whether they get it through a resolution of the Congress or by continued demand through the stamp organizations of America or through other channels.

Do you think for a moment there is not going to be a full and complete answer to the request made? Made for proper information and facts. Do you think that Mr. Farley or your party can hush up this scandal until the facts are known?

There may not be any law against this. There are probably many dishonest acts against which there is no law, but it is just as dishonest and just as crooked as if there was a law against it. That there is no law against it does not make it any less vicious or reprehensible. The Government is able to cope with its declared enemies, the public can meet attacks of its open and avowed opponents but political hand-outs under the hypocritical guise of a beneficiary with virtue on its tongue and deception in its heart is a dangerous foe and difficult to guard against.

I do not know the attitude of the members of my party, but I do know this: Now that the press—not the Republican Party—has brought this up, now that the press has produced these facts before the country, it is up to every public official to return those stamps to the Post Office Department, and then to provide an auction and sell the stamps to the public and put the money in the Treasury of the United States.

As it is, today, the Treasury of the United States has been looted and mulcted to the extent of millions for the benefit of a favored few, and most of them public officials. I hesitate to condemn public officials, but unless they return these stamps, they are subject to very severe condemnation, law or no law.

Mr. BLANTON. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I will yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from New York has enjoyed an unusual popularity in the past. Why does he want to make himself unpopular with all the people of the United States by this little old dirty attack on the Postmaster General?

Mr. FISH. I will ask the gentleman from Texas to stop his demagoguery. I am trying to do my duty and protect the

Government of the United States from being robbed and looted for the advantage of a preferred list of deserving Democrats, most of whom all hold high positions in the Government service. What an example to set for 10,000,000 stamp collectors and the rest of the American people.

Mr. BLANTON. The people of the United States are not interested in this attempt to make a mountain out of a molehill.

Mr. FISH. There are 10,000,000 of them that are interested in it, and I believe all the rest are who believe in fair play and square dealing.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, there may be a few stamp collectors.

Mr. FISH. Oh, the gentleman has sneered at the stamp collectors, as the Democrats did at Coolidge, who stood on the mountain peak of rugged honesty, and as most Democrats tried to smear Hoover for years; and now, because we have the temerity to get up and denounce one of the ugliest acts in any administration in our history, after trying to get the facts, the gentleman sneers at the stamp collectors.

Now I said in the first speech I made that Mr. Farley was entitled to a hearing, that he may have his side of the story. Did he take advantage of it? Did he answer a single question my colleague from New York asked? Not at all. That is why we now have a right and a political duty to criticize the skullduggery practiced in enriching public officials by presentation of sheets of ungummed and imperforate stamps, and there is no defense for it.

Mr. DOBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. DOBBINS. The gentleman says he wants to be fair, and yet he makes statements of fact based on a letter from Roberta Rowe. Does the gentleman understand that the face value of the stamps has been paid, and that the fictitious value is never received by the United States Treasury? They only get the face value of the stamps.

Mr. FISH. I know nothing about the Roberta Rowe letter and care less. I am very glad that the gentleman has asked about the value of the stamps when bought, because it proves nothing at all. I supposed every Member of the House who has heard this debate and followed it at all, knew that the favored few paid the face value of the stamps, whether 1 cent, 2 cents, or 3 cents.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, these ungummed imperforate stamps have never been issued before, not until this administration came into power. There has been a lot of loose talk that other administrations have issued these stamps. No administration has ever before issued ungummed imperforate stamps. This administration has done it on 20 different occasions, and has sold those stamps at their face value, not to the public—oh, no; but to a preferred list—and we don't know all of that list, and that is what we are trying to find out—most of whom are public officials, who were then automatically enriched 100 or, maybe, 200 times. It is not a question of 10 percent or 20 percent or 50 percent profit, but a hundred times or more. Automatically, as soon as they buy those stamps at 3 cents, the stamps become worth a dollar or more.

Mr. DOBBINS. Will the gentleman tell me where he gets his million dollars? Only \$800,000 of these stamps were sold in a year.

Mr. FISH. I said \$3,000,000. Those were the figures used by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLARD], and I shall use his figures, whether they be \$2,000,000 or \$4,000,000.

Mr. DOBBINS. Does the gentleman mean to say that a hundred million of those stamps—

Mr. FISH. Let me answer. Automatically the value of these ungummed and imperforate stamps did not jump from 1 cent to 2 cents, and that would be 100-percent increase; but it jumped from 1 cent to \$1 or maybe more, depending upon how many or how few were put out. That is the value given by collectors.

Those collectors, if they could buy these stamps at a public auction, would pay that amount of money for them, if they were ungummed and imperforate, in a limited number. The American stamp collectors would come in at public auction and pay for those stamps sums estimated at two or three million dollars; and that ought to go into the Treasury of the United States, but, instead of that, it has gone into the hands of public officials who, if they die tomorrow, would leave estates to be settled, and a value would be put upon those stamps, and it is said by reputable newspapermen and collectors of stamps that that value might be as high as \$300,000 for the President of the United States alone, but let us halve that, to be on the safe side, and that is \$150,000—or money that he has received out of the Treasury through no effort of his own, which will belong to his estate just as much as a Government bond. You might just as well give away some of these baby bonds, because of defects, to public officials on the same basis as the ungummed and imperforate stamps, as the baby bonds do not draw interest either.

Mr. O'MALLEY. If the gentleman is correct in that, the income-tax collector can get most of it.

Mr. FISH. Oh, no; they are not turned into money, and the value is increased only when they are sold.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Then, they are worth nothing at all until sold.

Mr. FISH. Certainly not; neither is any other form of property.

Mr. O'MALLEY. Then, what is the gentleman worrying about?

Mr. FISH. Because they are private property. What do you want to do—give private property to public officials, which, upon their death becomes of value?

Mr. O'MALLEY. Then the tax collector would get them.

Mr. FISH. Oh, the gentleman entertains peculiar ideas and peculiar logic. I am trying to state the facts—undeniable facts.

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Certainly.

Mr. LUCKEY. I am a new man and would like to know what it costs per hour to operate the United States Congress.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman will have to look that up in some standard dictionary.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. HEALEY. If the gentleman is correct in his statement that these stamps have such a great value, it might be a good idea to issue enough of them to derive funds enough to pay the bonus. Perhaps we could do it in that way.

Mr. FISH. If that is the gentleman's idea of paying the bonus, I suggest that he take it up with the soldiers.

Mr. HEALEY. I ask the gentleman the question—

Mr. FISH. Oh, that is the gentleman's own idea. Do not try to wish it on me. I know the gentleman wants to be facetious and to minimize the matter and belittle it and protect Mr. Farley and the administration. And I suppose, no matter how bad it is, if it were a thousand times worse he would do the same; and as far as I am concerned, I think it is not only unethical and dishonest but filled with graft from beginning to end unless the public officials who received them bring them all back to the Post Office Department and sell them to the American stamp collectors at auction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes more.

Mr. FISH. I want now to change to another subject. I made the statement the other day that there were two or three officeholders under the Democratic administration, not necessarily Democrats—and I named them—Robert Marshall, head of the Forestry Division in Indian Affairs, and Gardner Jackson in the A. A. A., and some lady, who had contributed to the Communist cause and to the rank and file committee for a bonus march.

None of them denied contributing. Some of them said they did not contribute for a bonus march. If they did

not contribute for a bonus march, it is so much the worse, because they contributed to a Communist organization—to Mr. Harold Hickerson, one of the best-known Communists in America. To do what? To incite strikes, riots, sabotage, industrial unrest, and urge the overthrow of the Government of the United States. Those men still hold office. I do not even advise now what should be done, but the National Defense Conference, meeting in convention the other day, voted unanimously that those Government officeholders should be dismissed from the service. I believe that every patriotic organization will make the same request before this year is over. I have made no such request. I have submitted the facts. They have not denied the facts. There are thousands of veterans of the World War, including disabled veterans, walking the streets looking for jobs, while you have in this administration not Democrats holding office, but men holding high office who contribute their funds to the Communist cause for Communist agitation and propaganda. The time has come for action—not excuses. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has again expired.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I agree with our colleague from New York [Mr. FISH] on one thing only. I think this Post Office Committee treated him outrageously. The gentleman says that they held this committee meeting to which he was invited at 11:20 a. m. That was outrageous. That was before our colleague from New York [Mr. FISH] had had his morning bath, and had his hair curled, his ears perfumed, and his morning coffee. They should have given him more time.

I have tried to picture in my mind the gentleman from New York, standing as he does about 6 feet 3 inches in his stocking feet—

Mr. FISH. The gentleman made this same speech last week.

Mr. BLANTON. Going down to that palatial new Post Office Department Building, which was built by his silk-hat provisioner, General Brown, but which is now occupied by somebody else, and walking into the office of the genial, honest Jim Farley, in whom even the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has absolute confidence, and raising this little question about ungummed stamps. I do not think that Ham would ever face Jim on such a mission.

In the history of this Government since there has been a Bureau of Engraving and Printing, since there have been stamps made, there never has been one cent received by the Government of the United States from stamps more than their face value. There never has been any sale for profit. That is all the Government ever gets from stamps. All the Government ever gets is the face value of the stamps. That is exactly what this Government got for every single memento stamp that was bought and retained by Jim Farley, or which is held by the President or any Cabinet officer or any of their children. They paid 100 cents on the dollar for them—the same that has always been paid to the United States by everyone else for special stamps.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. No. I am sorry. I am going to answer Ham. All of this hullabaloo has been raised here over nothing. Do you know what has caused it? I will tell you. Since this Postmaster General was sworn into office, and shortly after his President had taken the oath of office, it became apparent that there had been some crooked banking going on that had almost ruined many unsuspecting and credulous people of the United States, and the President entered an Executive order closing every bank in the United States, including every Wall Street bank. Some New Yorkers up there did not like it.

It then became apparent to an honest administration that was looking after the interests of the people that there were great financiers who had been theretofore closely connected with this Government who were fixing to ship their gold out

of the United States, and in order to protect the gold of this country and the gold reserve, that grave President of the United States, backed by his Cabinet, entered an Executive order that stopped that gold from being shipped out of the United States. But it made some New Yorkers and others mad.

Then a little later on they found out that crooked contracts had been let for carrying the air mail.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment I will. I must answer Ham first. Those crooked contracts came upon the scene. The President did not submit that to a commission, a \$500,000 commission, to have them look into it and report 2 or 3 years hence. The President did not do that. If he had followed recent precedent during the last 4 or 5 years, he would have submitted that to an expensive commission; but instead of doing that he entered an Executive order annulling every single dishonest contract. Even though it cost this Government a tremendous sum of money, he had the mail carried anyway. He had the mail carried by the Army until other arrangements could be made. That is what the President is for. When he finds dishonesty, weed it out; and whatever it costs to have honest government, pay it. Some New Yorkers did not like it.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a minute.

Mr. FISH. I just wanted to know when the gentleman was going to begin to answer me.

Mr. BLANTON. The fact that I am answering the gentleman is what is bothering him. They did not like it. I knew, just as well as I knew I was living, that sooner or later they would begin these little "nigger-shooter" attacks on the administration. They did not think it would be popular to attack the President. They know the people will not stand for that. Even up in Brother TINKHAM's district in Massachusetts they would not stand for it. If he were to jump on the President, it would be the most unpopular thing he could do up in Massachusetts. [Laughter.] So they do not jump on the President; they pick out the President's first lieutenant and try to make him the goat, and indirectly attack the President from the back door.

I want the people of the United States, tomorrow and in the next few days in every State in this Union, to get today's RECORD; and I want them to read that resolution that was introduced by our friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. MILLARD]. He is our friend; I like him, everyone of us likes him. Although we may differ on things across the aisle, we all like him. I want them to read his resolution when they get today's RECORD. Then I want them to read that splendid committee report which was filed in the RECORD and which gives the answer of the Post Office Department showing the facts about the matter. Then I want them to read this speech of our friend from New York [Mr. FISH], made this evening, and try to see any justification for it. It is going to leave our friend from New York [Mr. FISH] standing up in the air without a single support under him. I am afraid it is going to destroy his popularity.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. FISH. I just wanted to know whether the gentleman is going to talk about the Townsend plan next.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman from New York skipped about like a butterfly or a humming bird, from Moscow, Russia, to New York. That gives me pretty good latitude, does it not, in answering? Of course, to follow him I have got to jump from Moscow to New York, but I can do it. [Laughter.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am not going to let the gentlewoman from Massachusetts destroy my speech on "Ham", because, of course, anything she says to me I have to agree with. That is the reason I cannot yield to her.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? The gentleman said he would yield.

Mr. BLANTON. I am almost afraid to yield to her.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thought the gentleman never broke a promise.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I yield. [Laughter.]

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does it not seem passing strange that a year ago when the error in judgment of the Postmaster General sent 12 gallant Army flyers to their deaths and severely injured 5 in less than a month the gentleman's side tried to prevent discussion of the matter.

Mr. BLANTON. I cannot yield further. It was no error in judgment. I want to say to my good friend the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that in Washington this last year, not in the Air Service but in the ordinary walks of life, there were one-hundred-and-twenty-odd people who lost their lives right here in Washington from automobile accidents. Why, any one of us is liable to fall here. We have seen colleagues fall in action here on the floor, in harness, working; that is one of the hazards of life. A flyer takes a hazard all the time. The man in business takes a hazard.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Not such a hazard as those Army mail pilots were forced to take.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield further, as I have not the time.

My colleague from New York [Mr. FISH] said I had tried to besmear Calvin Coolidge. He never was so much mistaken in his life. I do not believe there has ever been a Democrat in this House who was closer to Calvin Coolidge than I was. When that great calamity caused him, after midnight, to get up and take the oath of office as President of the United States, and Western Union called me up at home, I got up and dressed and went to town to my office and sent him a telegram congratulating him and the Government on having him as President of the United States. I believed him. I have sat at breakfast with him in the White House at the same table. There has never been a Republican President of the United States for whom I had higher regard or greater respect or in whom I had more abiding confidence; and I am not going to let the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] say I have besmirched Calvin Coolidge. Never in my life did I do it.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. FISH. Does not the gentleman remember the denunciation he made of Teapot Dome? He was so bitter in his denunciation I thought he would almost have apoplexy.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I did denounce Teapot Dome—not Calvin Coolidge; I was talking about dishonest, corrupt Cabinet officers—not Calvin Coolidge. We kept on at that time until we got some of them, did we not?

Mr. FISH. That is just what we are going to do. I know what I am talking about.

Mr. BLANTON. Never in your lifetime. It seems to me there was a Secretary of the Navy named Denby, who was removed from office; that is, he was forced to resign. It seems to me there was a Secretary of the Interior named Albert B. Fall, who was removed from office, was indicted, tried, convicted, and sent to the penitentiary for taking \$100,000 in a little black satchel here in Washington when he tried to give away hundreds of millions of dollars of Government oil. That is what I was after; that is the kind of transactions that were going on. But Calvin Coolidge was not responsible for them; it was dishonesty in his Cabinet. If he had known anything about it, he would have wiped it out as quickly as any Democrat, because he was as honest as the day is long.

Now, what is all this little "two-bit" stamp fuss about?

People are not interested in it at all. A long time ago people used to lick stamps. They have quit licking them. The business men do not lick stamps any more. "Ham", you are now just licking a 2-cent stamp.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to myself. Mr. Chairman, in America we believe in religious liberty and the right of every individual to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. A tribute this evening has been paid to that great American, Thomas Jefferson, for

the great principles he stood for and taught. However, we have never been so boastful in America as to believe that we could dictate to other sovereign people what form of Government they should and must have.

Reference was made by my friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] to the recognition of Russia. May I say that the President recognized Russia without asking for the advice of the business men of the North, the South, or the West. He did it because he thought it was right to recognize a sovereign with 165,000,000 people. Other nations have recognized Russia, not because they any more than we approve their form of government. We have recognized, since we became a nation, the right of sovereign people to determine for themselves their own form of government.

It ill becomes my good friend from New York at this late day to complain about the recognition of Russia, since this House and the Senate, following the President's recognition of Russia, voted appropriations to send an Ambassador to establish consulates and to build an embassy there. My friend the gentleman from New York voted for these appropriations.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield? The gentleman is not criticizing me for that. May I say I think we have a very good Ambassador there, too?

Mr. OLIVER. I make the statement that we are estopped from criticizing the action of the President in recognizing Russia since we, including the gentleman from New York, voted at the last Congress large sums of money to make effective such recognition.

Mr. FISH. There was nothing else to do. I am sure the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes; but I disagree with the gentleman. If I had entertained the views the gentleman expresses today, I would have refused to give express approval of the act of the President in recognizing Russia by voting money to make such recognition effective.

Mr. FISH. Does not the gentleman know that we could not foresee what was going to happen at that time?

Mr. OLIVER. No one could have foreseen more than the gentleman could what was going to happen, even assuming that the gentleman is right as to what has happened.

The gentleman was relying, it seems, on what he hoped was for the best; and in fairness he must concede this to others.

May I say in conclusion that the great underlying purpose behind the recognition of Russia was world peace, and it has had that effect, whether you agree with me or not. No one can read the message delivered by our Secretary of State at Montevideo, which undoubtedly had the President's full approval, nor recall the President's message in withdrawing the marines from Haiti, and not understand that the governing motive behind his every act and utterance has been to promote world peace and to endeavor to secure the cooperation of all nations to that great end. You will remember the message he sent to more than 50 sovereign rulers, urging the reduction of armaments on sea and land. Consider all he has said and done and tell me if from the very first the one ever-present actuating motive of the President, beginning with the message to Montevideo, the recognition of Russia, the withdrawal of the marines from the other countries to the south of us, has not been to inspire and stimulate a desire for world peace on the part of the people of the earth? [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TINKHAM].

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Chairman, the bill now before the Committee includes an appropriation of \$174,630 as the contribution of the United States to the International Labor Organization. This item should be stricken from the bill for the following reasons:

First. Because the appropriation is based upon a joint resolution which was adopted by the Congress through trickery, fraud, and mendacity of the Secretary of Labor.

Second. Because it involves the United States in the political affairs of Europe, the International Labor Organiza-

tion being a part of the League of Nations and established by part 13 of the Treaty of Versailles.

Third. Because the joint resolution, in pursuance of which the appropriation is proposed, is unconstitutional.

Fourth. Because under the terms of the International Labor Organization, the United States is subject to trial and judgment and the enforcement of economic boycotts and sanctions by the Court of the League of Nations, which Court is entirely outside the judicial system of the United States, and therefore there is involved the relinquishment of sovereign rights of the United States.

The joint resolution, in pursuance of which this appropriation is proposed, was introduced in both the Senate and the House just before adjournment last June. No hearings were held on the resolution by the Senate and House committees reporting the resolution. No witnesses appeared before the committees. A quorum was not present when the committees voted to report the measure. The resolution passed the Senate without debate or explanation and without a roll call in a day of great confusion. The discussion of the resolution in the House was limited to 40 minutes, the debate occurred late at night, and the resolution was passed by a margin of four votes, after coercive tactics had been employed to change a sufficient number of votes which had already been cast against the resolution to ensure its passage. This change of votes is shown in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—volume 78, part 11, page 12241.

All that was presented to the committees or to the House in support of the resolution was a letter from the Secretary of Labor which, among other things, stated:

The Organization is not even now an integral part of the League of Nations, and membership in the Organization does not imply affiliation with the League. * * *

This statement is the grossest perversion of the truth. It is squarely contrary to the facts—facts established by an indelible record, the Treaty of Versailles. This statement contained in the letter of the Secretary of Labor was intended to deceive. The Secretary knew that the Congress of the United States was opposed to entry into the League of Nations and would not vote for entry knowingly. Entry was, therefore, made surreptitiously and fraudulently.

Article 392 of the Treaty of Versailles states:

The International Labor Office shall be established at the seat of the League of Nations as part of the organization of the League.

The International Labor Office is one of the two parts of the International Labor Organization. The other part is the International Labor Conferences.

Article 427 of the Treaty of Versailles refers to the International Labor Office as "permanent machinery * * * associated with that of the League of Nations."

Article 393 of the Treaty of Versailles provides that—

Any question as to which are the members of the chief industrial importance shall be decided by the Council of the League of Nations.

Article 387 explicitly states that membership in the League of Nations shall "carry with it membership in" the Labor Organization.

Article 399 provides that the expenses of the International Labor Office and of the International Labor Conferences shall be met "out of the general funds of the League" and that—

The director shall be responsible to the Secretary-General of the League for the proper expenditure of all moneys paid to him in pursuance of this article.

Article 398 provides that the International Labor Office—

Shall be entitled to the assistance of the Secretary General of the League of Nations in any matter in which it can be given.

Article 405 of the Treaty of Versailles provides that it is for the Secretary General of the League of Nations to communicate to the members of the Labor Organization certified copies of recommendations and draft conventions adopted by the International Labor Conferences; members are to inform the Secretary General of the League of Nations of action taken on such recommendations and draft conventions, and

their ratifications of draft conventions are to be communicated to him.

Article 406 provides that a convention—of the Labor Organization—which is ratified is to be registered by the Secretary General of the League of Nations.

These articles of the Treaty of Versailles show that by entering the International Labor Organization the United States is inextricably involved in a mechanism which is a part of the League of Nations; that it is involved with the Council of the League of Nations and with the Secretary General of the League of Nations. As will be seen a little later, membership in the International Labor Organization involves the United States also with the Permanent Court of International Justice of the League of Nations, adherence to which Court only recently was decisively rejected by the Senate.

The League of Nations is a political organization. It is primarily interested in the enforcement of the Treaty of Versailles and in the political affairs of Europe.

There are additional reasons why this proposed appropriation should not be made.

The joint resolution in pursuance of which the appropriation is proposed is unconstitutional. United States membership in the International Labor Organization to be constitutional must be by treaty and not by joint resolution.

The Federal Government is a government of limited and enumerated powers. This has been repeatedly determined by the Supreme Court of the United States. The tenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States has been held to mean precisely this, that the Federal Government is a government of limited and enumerated powers. The tenth amendment reads:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Unless a Federal act, a resolution—as in this case—or a statute can cling to some constitutional grant of power, it is no legal act, resolution, or statute at all, but is pure usurpation.

There is in the Constitution no delegated power which allows the Congress to provide for United States membership in the International Labor Organization without a treaty. Alleged precedents for such action are nullities, and if challenged before the Supreme Court of the United States would be abrogated.

Even more can be said in protest of United States membership in the International Labor Organization by joint resolution.

Under article 412 of the Treaty of Versailles, upon application of the governing body of the International Labor Office, the Secretary General of the League of Nations is to nominate members of commissions of inquiry to consider complaints as to the execution of conventions ratified.

Article 414 provides:

When the Commission of Enquiry has fully considered the complaint, it shall prepare a report embodying its findings on all questions of fact relevant to determining the issue between the parties and containing such recommendations as it may think proper as to the steps which should be taken to meet the complaint and the time within which they should be taken.

It shall also indicate in this report the measures, if any, of an economic character against a defaulting government which it considers to be appropriate, and which it considers other governments would be justified in adopting.

Article 415 provides:

The Secretary General of the League of Nations shall communicate the report of the Commission of Enquiry to each of the governments concerned in the complaint, and shall cause it to be published.

Each of these governments shall within 1 month inform the Secretary General of the League of Nations whether or not it accepts the recommendations contained in the report of the Commission; and if not, whether it proposes to refer the complaint to the Permanent Court of International Justice of the League of Nations.

Article 416 provides:

In the event of any member failing to take the action required by article 405, with regard to a recommendation or draft conven-

tion, any other member shall be entitled to refer the matter to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

Article 417 provides:

The decision of the Permanent Court of International Justice in regard to a complaint or matter which has been referred to it in pursuance of article 415 or article 416 shall be final.

Article 418 provides:

The Permanent Court of International Justice may affirm, vary, or reverse any of the findings or recommendations of the Commission of Enquiry, if any, and shall in its decision indicate the measures, if any, of an economic character which it considers to be appropriate and which other governments would be justified in adopting against a defaulting government.

These provisions show that by becoming a member of the International Labor Organization the United States becomes subject to the compulsory jurisdiction of the League Court, to trial and judgment and to enforcement of economic boycotts or sanctions by this Court, a tribunal outside of the judicial system of the United States. This involves the relinquishment of the sovereign rights of the United States. For the Congress to relinquish sovereign rights by a joint resolution is not only unconstitutional but is disloyal and revolutionary. [Applause.]

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KENNEY].

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Chairman, considerable discussion has been had this afternoon about traffic in stamps, but nothing has been mentioned about traffic of far greater concern and of real importance to the people of the United States.

I do not happen to be a stamp collector, and I do not believe it has appeared in the Record whether the gentleman from New York or the gentleman from Texas is a stamp collector, although each of them has discussed the question at great length. However, I do receive many, many stamps or bonds, or however you may characterize them, daily through the mails. This morning I received a batch from the great State of Texas. I believe they were mailed from Abilene, but it so happened that they come from a gentleman who resides in the city of San Antonio.

Before I refer further to these particular stamps, bonds, or certificates, I should like to mention that we are all concerned about conserving our natural resources. I feel there is no dispute about this, because even the President, the leader of the Nation, has lately addressed the Congress with respect to the matter.

If money is not a natural resource, it certainly is the most familiar resource of the American people. We have gentlemen here in Congress who want to create more of it for circulation throughout the Nation, but I have heard of no one who is interested in conserving the money supply that we have in this Nation and preventing it from going into foreign channels at the rate it is now going through the purchase of foreign lottery tickets by the people of this country. Nearly all the nations of the earth have lotteries, many of them government monopolies, and they are sending their tickets in here by the thousands, by the hundreds of thousands, and these lotteries are being patronized by our people every day.

I should like to display some of these that come up from Texas, showing that they were purchased in order to help out the veterans of France; others to contribute to the hospitals in the Irish Free State; and I have innumerable others, which I have before exhibited to the House, coming from practically every country of the world. I believe it is time we should make some serious endeavor to keep the money that we have here at home for the purposes of our own Government, instead of putting it into the coffers of other governments, sending it to Italy for the purpose of building its Navy, to Ireland to support their hospitals, to France for the benefit of its veterans, to Norway for old-age pensions, and to other countries for various other purposes.

The drain on this country is more than any of us will realize without a study of the question. I can only refer you back to prohibition days, when 1,000,000 people a day went from this country to Canada, and not only this, but

on one Labor Day there were 1,000,000 cars in Canada with American tourists, with an average of three persons to the car. This would mean that \$3,000,000 would be spent there daily amongst the Canadian people. However, Mr. Chairman, this is nothing to the drain of money going out of this country for lotteries, and, in my opinion, Congress could do no better than to consider without delay and pass my bill providing for a national lottery, to be conducted by the Federal Government.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEY. I yield.

Mr. FOCHT. As I understand the gentleman, his theory of a lottery is not that it should be perpetual, but that we should raise enough money to pay, say, the bonus and the national debt and then abandon it?

Mr. KENNEY. That would be my idea.

Mr. FOCHT. And the lottery would be operated by the Government?

Mr. KENNEY. It would be absolutely a Government monopoly. I may say I think the time has come when, in my opinion, property taxes only should be levied by our cities and towns; when income taxes ought to be confined to the States alone; and sales taxes, preferably a manufacturers' sales tax, which would exempt food, clothing, and medicine should be controlled solely by the Federal Government, and then we should have a national lottery operated by the Federal Government to provide funds which would help out all around, which would be allocated so as to do the most possible good.

Now, besides the participation of our people in foreign lotteries on a staggering scale, there is tremendous trafficking in private lotteries, many of which mulct our people dishonestly. From writers on the subject, gigantic sum ranging between three and six billion dollars a year passes through the channels of privately conducted lotteries. From the operation of these lotteries gangsters derived the chief sources of revenue for carrying on their criminal activities.

Only the other day the Committee on the District of Columbia asked for and was given permission to go out and investigate crime here. What was the first reaction? When the investigation began one of the Commissioners testified that the operation of lotteries was so wide-spread that he felt it was beyond the power of the authorities to control and recommended legalization. The newspapers of this city and other places immediately began to print accounts of crime within the District, linking it with the numbers rackets, policy slips, and other various forms of games of chance—games, but few chances for the gullible public.

Why, do you know that the great bootlegger of Chicago made more through his lotteries than he did by trafficking in liquor when it was unlawful to do so?

Do you know that the foremost bootlegger of New York made more money in his lottery schemes than he did by violating the liquor laws during prohibition days?

The sums involved are tremendous. If you will read the report of the Assistant Solicitor of the Post Office Department for 1932, you will find that he there states that the Post Office Department, in each of the years 1931 and 1932, kept \$500,000,000 from going abroad to foreign lotteries—a billion dollars in a 2-year period; upward of \$200,000,000 is said to leave the country annually for participation in foreign lotteries, and everyone knows of the many prize winners who actually reside in the United States. If we are to conserve our resources, let us conserve the money, the most important resource of all if we are to abide by the trend of thought expressed so often in this House.

A national lottery would conserve the vast sums of money annually leaving the country. It would also tend to, and, I believe, would sound the death knell of the dishonest private lottery. Furthermore, it would prove to be a boon to the taxpayer—a needed lift in distress.

Our taxes will increase. The great debt must be met. There will be need for all available funds. Stop then and consider! It is perhaps safe to say that if a fair proportion of the fabulous amount of money spent on lotteries could be made to flow into the coffers of the Treasury, a long

step would be taken to pay off the obligations we have incurred and will shortly incur, and a way would be at hand to discharge the huge national debt, which may run as high as \$45,000,000,000.

Now, a lottery is an honorable institution when conducted by the Government. I have in my pocket two historic documents bearing testimony of the benefits of a governmental lottery. Hard pressed, the first patriots of our country, including George Washington, resorted to the lottery as a means of raising revenue for the great emergency in the fight for our liberty, and lottery money virtually won the Revolutionary War. The idea in this country originated with our patriots and our clergymen.

In the small State of Rhode Island alone are many evidences of the efficacy of the lottery in the building of churches in this country.

The "Presbyterian, or Congregational Society" desiring to erect a building sought permission from the legislature to conduct a lottery, petitioning that the "best interest of the community to be restored to gospel order", which seemed "impracticable without the interposition of the assembly by granting a lottery."

Trinity Parish, Newport, was granted a lottery to build a new steeple for the church.

The inhabitants of the town of Cranston petitioned for the lottery privilege for the Baptists to build a meeting house which was made possible only through lottery money.

The right to conduct a lottery was granted to the wardens of the Episcopal Church in Providence to build a steeple and procure a clock.

A lottery provided the funds for the Baptist meeting house in East Greenwich and also in Coventry.

In Providence the finest church of the city stands as a testimonial to the lottery, and so I could go on and on.

Now, as formerly, hosts of our citizens will respond to the call for small contributions which they will willingly make patriotically and for the public benefit, if only we permit them to do so by participation in a lottery to be conducted by the Government. They will be happy and glad to help conserve our money supply; to do their part in wiping out the numbers racket, the policy game, and types of that kind invariably linked with the criminal element; and further to pave the way for the payment of the great national debt in a manner that would relieve the load of the taxpayer and at the same time react to the great benefit of the Government of the United States. Let us pass the lottery bill. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Chairman, after an afternoon of such thrills as we have had, it would be rather a prosy gesture to introduce the tariff. I am not going to give you my promised speech on the tariff this afternoon, but I rise to make a correction of a little inadvertence this afternoon on the part of my friend from North Carolina [Mr. BULWINKLE], a very fine gentleman. He persisted in the idea that the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act had as its author Senator Grundy, of Pennsylvania. There are two reasons why Mr. Grundy was not the author of that bill. In the first place, with the knowledge he has of the manufacturing business and the interest that he would have in the manufacturers of Pennsylvania and the North, if he had been the author of the bill he would have made a better law than that which came out. Secondly, he was opposed to the bill. He may have had something to do in framing it, in getting what he could for Pennsylvania and the manufacturers of the North at the time, but it was not the bill he wanted. He was opposed to the principal feature of the bill, which is operative now, and I believe was reenacted here by this House a while ago. I refer to the 50-percent flexibility clause, and gentlemen here must know that anyone who is really soundly versed in the tariff cannot conceive that that would be the correct policy for anyone who wanted to have a protective tariff so that the business man might know when he should stock up

and when he should sell his manufactured product. If the business man is compelled to run up and down the line to find out where this 50-percent flexibility clause stops or begins, it would be impossible to adjust himself. A man who is in favor of the tariff, who needs a protective tariff, wants it fixed somewhere, whether high, or low, or moderate. What a man who is for the tariff for business wants to know is where it is and whatever it is, so that he will adjust himself to it. Therefore, anyone so well versed in the policies and understanding of the tariff as is Mr. Grundy, I say for him that if he had had anything to do with the Smoot-Hawley tariff, it would have been a better tariff, and there would have been no flexibility clause.

Mr. DOBBINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOCHT. Yes.

Mr. DOBBINS. Then I understand that Mr. Grundy liked the rates all right but he did not like the possibility of having lower rates written into the bill.

Mr. FOCHT. I am not familiar with the more restricted and narrow phases. I am taking a broader and more comprehensive view of the thing than the gentleman suggests.

Mr. DOBBINS. He wanted to be sure he could hang onto what he got.

Mr. FOCHT. Whatever it was—anyone believing in the tariff, as I do, would give him credit for hanging on, so that he could protect our industries, instead of having now, if you want anybody to work, to starve the workers back into the factories. We did not do that under the good old Republican tariff provisions of another day.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK].

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, before becoming a Member of Congress I thought I saw distinctly the right road for a majority of the American people to follow in an effort to rebuild our business structure, which has been on the decline since 1920. After having served a month in Congress and getting first-hand information on our national affairs, I am convinced now more than before that the road which I thought was the right road is the proper deduction to be made.

Here in Congress the paramount question is whether the President is going to turn to the right or turn to the left, and Members of Congress and the great American lobbyists spend most of their time in guessing upon this subject, and do not spend very much time on the more important task of determining whether there is not any other alternative except the right or the left. In my judgment, both courses are wrong, and I hope the President will not follow either course.

Turning to the right means, in simple English, turning toward reaction, and the country, after 155 years of reaction, except a few short intervals, was presented on March 4, 1932, with the evidence of the results of reaction. Every bank in the United States was closed, every insurance company was unable to meet its obligations, and business generally was completely paralyzed. During these years we had followed the course of reaction; and when the final plunge downward came, we found we had been following the implicit direction of such disciples of reaction as Morgan, Mellon, Mills, Mitchell, and Myers. The Republican Party had been subservient to them, in all things, and because of it the party was overwhelmingly defeated at the polls, and the administration of our affairs turned over to the Democratic Party under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt.

What is left of the Republican Party is pretty well represented in Congress by Republican Senators and Congressmen. As the proceedings in Congress unfold, it is apparent that this discarded party is making attempts to gather strength to become again a party of national leadership. This leadership cannot be obtained so long as the machinery of the party remains with those of reactionary tendencies or with those who were closely associated with the leaders during the past Republican administrations. Nothing but new ideas, new men, and progressive principles will ever in our day return the Republican Party to power. It will require more than mere criticism of the Democratic Party; it will require positive and constructive leadership based

upon issues that are progressive and in which the common voters of America believe. The voters demand a program, and the Republicans of the Senate and House have so far failed to present a positive program; and, in my judgment, the machinery of the Republican Party will still be in the hands of the reactionary element when the next convention is held.

The voters of America will never follow this road to the right. They have had enough. The question of reactionary or progressive is not limited by party labels—there are progressive Democrats and progressive Republicans. The Democratic Party is just as susceptible to the forces of reaction as the Republicans have been, and unless the Democratic Party remains progressive, it will be supplanted and the leadership taken over by some party that is progressive.

There is another road which the American people can take, and which many good citizens now believe in taking because of the lack of confidence in either of the two major parties, and that is the road to the left. If the American people take this road, it surely means the destruction of our present form of government. It means the building, in the place of this government, a new government fashioned after the plan of the Union of Soviet States of Russia. The advocates of this system state that our present government is a capitalistic government and that, before the people can arrive at the millenium in government, our capitalistic system must be destroyed. No matter how the phraseology may be framed, the cold fact remains that those who seek to build on this continent a union of soviet States must and do believe in the destruction of this Government.

Those who wish to follow this road to the left must be prepared to give up all individual property, for all property is capital, and must be prepared to merge themselves and their individual efforts under a system where the state is the thing for which individuals exist, instead of the American doctrine of the state existing for the individual and all members of society. Along with this system will go the doctrine of the destruction of all religious doctrines to which the individuals cling, and the branding of the teachings of Christ as a means of holding the people back in their march toward the blessings of a soviet.

This road to the left can be accomplished by only one method, and that is a revolution, either mild or severe. It never has come except through severe methods resulting in the loss of property and life. As I view the concepts of the soviet, I do not believe the American people are willing to follow that road to the left. I do not believe they ever will take that road unless they are forced to take that course through the further operation of this Government by those who are determined upon forcing the people to take the road to the right. The "right wingers", so called, are making Communists faster than the communistic school itself. The lessons of history clearly demonstrate that the reactionaries will continue to insist upon their theory of government to the last. They become so engrossed in their own self-declared patriotism that they would permit the destruction of their Government before showing a willingness to ease the pressure from their own reactionary and selfish purposes.

I do not believe the American people will take either the road to the right or the road to the left. There is still another road open to them. That road has the dimmest trail ahead of all. It has in the past been followed by a few great progressives, but not many. In different and varying degrees it has been followed by Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, William Jennings Bryan, Robert M. La Follette, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and many great progressive leaders of the present day. The greatest leader of them all in our day, so far, was the immortal fighting Bob La Follette, Sr., of Wisconsin, who did more to stir the people to the responsibilities of government for the people, and who did more to blaze the trail on this right road ahead than anyone of his day and generation.

That road is the road straight ahead. That road recognizes that we have the best form of government on earth, and that this Government was intended by the framers of

it to be a just government, instituted by the people, coming from the people, and designed to be for the protection of the people. Following this road we also recognize that during the more than 150 years of our national existence we have permitted this great experiment of government to drift out of the hands of the general public and to be under the control of a few who use it not for the good of all but for the enrichment of the few at the expense of the many. Those who follow this road believe that this Government has turned some of its most important functions over to private interests to operate for their own advantage. They believe that this Government never should have surrendered to the banking interests of the country the power to issue money and regulate the value thereof. They believe the power granted to Congress by the Constitution in this respect should be exercised by Congress for the benefit of all of the people instead of permitting the banks to use the Government's cash and credit without interest. They believe that in the years that have passed that this power, the financial power of a few, has been built through a system of special privilege granted by legislatures and by Congress. They believe that the present financial collapse of the country is due to the results of that "special privilege" system and to nothing else, and that unless we regain this power to drive special privilege out of the control of the Government, then the Government itself is in danger of being taken over by those on the right, which means a financial class dictatorship, or by those on the left, which means a Soviet class dictatorship.

At the present moment we are groping about to find the correct trail. I think the President means to find that correct road; and merely because he has not rushed headlong in some direction, right or wrong, he is charged by both sides with a tendency to turn to the right and by the others with a pronounced tendency to the left. Since the business of the Nation had collapsed almost completely when the President assumed office, it comes with poor grace for the "right wingers" to complain. The "right wingers" must forever stand charged with the collapse of business accomplished through the blind following of a reactionary course. The "left wingers" should not complain since they must admit that the President has at least made an honest effort to restore a government of protection to the people.

In this great change in the workings of this Government which we are now undergoing those who believe in the road straight ahead still have confidence that eventually during his term of office the President will take possession of our constitutional power to issue money and regulate the value thereof and take this power away from the banking interests of the country. They believe that the most radical change to be credited to the administration of the President will be in our financial reorganization. It has become so overwhelmingly certain that a continuation of the present banking practices can have no other effect than to destroy all business and finally all confidence in the Government itself. No people can struggle under an interest system under which the banking circles can command Government cash and credit for a nominal charge and, on the other hand, pyramid credits on a ratio of 10 times that credit, drawing interest on pyramided credits as well as cash. Such a system today demands interest payments equal to the income of all farms in 1934 and all labor for the same period. Under it we have increased the public and private debt to more than three times the value of all our property, and still the people are asked to pay. To pay something that cannot be paid means, if not checked by laws and moratoria, the destruction of all property.

The pyramiding of credits must be stopped; the granting of the Government's right to control money to "special interests" must cease; the Government must build a new conception of the functions of money and the right to the free use of it for the benefit of all the people and not the few. There must at all times be sufficient money in circulation to do the Nation's business, and, more than that, a plan to keep that money in circulation must be devised.

That is the road straight ahead. It does not straddle, it does not waver, but leads straight on. If we follow it, as I am confident we will, we can again consecrate this great Government to its original purposes. We can make of it a means of self-government and mutual help. It can establish the principle of service to all instead of special privilege to the few; it can reestablish confidence of the American people in the greatest government on earth. By taking away special privilege we can prevent the further accumulation of wealth in a few hands. Through income and inheritance taxes we can adjust the wrong that has been done through the years of our existence. We can still preserve individual effort and initiative, and individual property, and encourage industry among the people by establishing now, "Equal opportunity for all but special privilege to none." We can assist our more unfortunate brothers by demanding in our business transactions service as well as a reasonable compensation for our efforts. We can demand that the right to live is the first guaranty of any free government, and that a few shall not be permitted to wallow in riches while the millions are in distress. We can turn the love of profits into a love of country; we can melt down the golden calf and pray to the divine Ruler of the universe; we can shun the god of Mammon and follow the teachings of Christ.

Will the Democratic administration take the necessary steps now to bring about this new interpretation of government? I have hopes that under the leadership of the President this will be done. As a Republican I stand ready with my vote and with whatever power I possess to assist them. I have offered criticisms to the working of the administration, and expect to do so in the future, but only in the way of constructive criticism and not for political purposes. Should the Democrats fail to fully appreciate their present responsibilities, or understand their duty to the American people, or fail to follow that straight road ahead, then they will be displaced by some other party—some new party, probably not yet born—which will come up from the body of the people themselves, consecrated to the accomplishment of the great task ahead. That task will be accomplished by some party. I know the spirit of the American people, I know how sincere they are, and I know that the determination to preserve this Government and make it a just Government is the hope and prayer of every loyal American citizen.

We have tried the experiment of being the world's banker. We have in doing so thrown away \$10,000,000,000 and thereby increased the burden of debt under which we are compelled to struggle; we have tried to make the world safe for democracy; we have tried the experiment of collecting debts of private individuals against foreign countries; we have consumed the best blood of our people in doing so, and we are bankrupt individually and as a nation for what we have done. Let us now make an honest effort as Americans to do something for America. Let us build upon this continent a great nation, content with our own possessions, and permit the people of other nations to work out their own destiny. We can best serve the people of the world by demonstrating that we are capable of preserving a Government here that is just; a Government that protects the weak and curbs the strong; a Government which can lay claim to a full compliance with its Declaration of Independence and its purposes of existence. When we have accomplished this, no power on earth can destroy it; we need not fear enemies from within or from without; and its national defense will be secure in the patriotic impulse of its citizens to defend it.

Thus and thus only will we become a power in the world; thus and thus only will our influence be felt and be respected throughout the nations of the earth.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the

Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5255) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice and for the judiciary, and for the Departments of Commerce and Labor for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS—H. R. 5255

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken or who may hereafter speak in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having under consideration the appropriation bill for the State, Justice, Labor, and Commerce Departments, may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire to avail myself of this opportunity, so graciously granted by you, to pay a brief tribute to a great humanitarian fraternal organization. I refer to the Fraternal Order of Eagles, and I speak from personal knowledge and experience of its activities, for I have had the honor and privilege to be a member of Hoquiam (Wash.) Aerie since 1916, a period of 19 years.

It was the Eagles' organization which sponsored the first workmen's compensation law in America and campaigned for its enactment in State after State, until today practically every Commonwealth in the Nation has such a measure upon its statute books.

An Eagle drew the first mother's pension law in our country, the order aided in its passage, and that movement also spread under Eagle leadership to every State, with but few exceptions, in the entire Nation.

It was also an Eagle, Past Worthy President Frank E. Hering, who in 1904, in a theater in Indianapolis, Ind., made the first-known public plea for the designation of a national day to be set aside to honor the mothers of America.

OLD-AGE-PENSION LEGISLATION

However, it is as the champion of old-age-pension legislation that the Eagles Order is known and beloved from one end of this land to the other, having carried on the long fight which has resulted in the enactment of old-age-pension laws in no less than 26 States, thereby hastening the happy day, now about to be realized, when we will have a national old-age-pension act in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, important and worthy as all these achievements are, I desire now to call attention to another achievement which is perhaps of even greater consequence to the American people. The members of the Fraternal Order of Eagles had the vision and love of humanity to urge during the past 12 years increased wages and shorter working hours for the laboring men of America, which is the very essence of the National Recovery Act. Also, during the same period, they also advocated a huge Federal public-works program as the most effective means of providing needed employment for the large number of citizens who have become the unfortunate victims of technological displacement in our modern highly mechanized industrial system.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, some of the underlying principles of the Eagles' stabilization of employment bill, H. R. 2, to establish a national board to study and plan economic stability, introduced in this body by our distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], have already been embodied in the National Recovery Act. The bill in its entirety will undoubtedly be enacted into law as soon as its merits are fully recognized by the Membership of this body, for it is being favored with the friendly consideration of that great Eagle who now sits in the White House, our noble President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who is a life member of Buffalo (N. Y.) Aerie.

LOANS TO FARMERS IN DROUGHT- AND STORM-STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House conferees may have until midnight tonight within which time to file a report on the bill (H. R. 3247) to meet conditions created by the 1934 drought and to provide for

loans to farmers in drought- and storm-stricken areas, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to—
Mr. COCHRAN, for today, on account of important business.
Mr. BIERMANN, for 2 days, on account of illness.
Mr. LANHAM, for today, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, January 31, this House voted on the conference report on S. 1175, the bill to extend the functions of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for 2 years. As one of the majority party who voted against this measure, I should like to make my position on this bill clear.

On Tuesday, January 29, this House began open consideration of this bill. This was 2 days before the expiration of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under the then existing law. There were probably few Members of this House who desired to see the Reconstruction Finance Corporation terminate its activities at 12 o'clock midnight January 31. Speaking for myself, I can frankly say that I wanted the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to continue in operation. This date of expiration was well known to the Members of this body, yet we had no opportunity to take it up on the floor until within less than 54 hours of the dead line. In these 54 hours we were to make such revisions in the bill as might be deemed necessary and to complete this legislation affecting one of the most vital agencies now in operation.

The highly esteemed and eminently capable members of the Committee on Banking and Currency presented to us this bill, S. 1175, and their report thereon. After a brief debate we agreed upon this bill, making several amendments. Conference committees of the two Houses met, and after a lengthy discussion made their report, in which it was found, according to one of the House conferees, that their colleagues from the Senate had receded from their differences except in two cases. The differences on which our conferees gave in related to the provision to give adequate protection to the small bondholder in real-estate securities, and the amendment to section 12 (a) providing for relief of tax interests.

On Thursday, January 31, a few short hours before the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would automatically die, we were placed in a position where we could either accept the conference report or allow the expiration of the Corporation to become effective. I wanted, as did the people whom I represent, to see that some measure of protection was given to real-estate bondholders, and to see the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] enacted in the final bill. The activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, commendable as they have been, have not, in my opinion, given adequate protection and assistance to the small investors. As it now stands, without further legislation, I cannot see where the small investor in real-estate bonds will receive the protection and assistance that he deserves. The amendment to section 12 (a) would have provided a very beneficial measure of relief from interest on taxes to the people whom I represent.

When the bill came to a final vote following the conference report, I cast my vote against it, knowing full well the bill would pass, to show my protest against what I then and now regard as a grave omission in this bill as finally enacted.

DIRECTORS OF COLUMBIA INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following appointments, which were read by the Clerk:

Pursuant to the provisions of title 24, section 236, United States Code, the Chair appoints as Directors of the Columbia Institute for the Deaf the following Members of the House: Mr. Bloom, of New York, and Mr. FOCHT, of Pennsylvania.

GEN. BALLINGTON BOOTH

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a statement of the work of the Volunteers of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I deem it an honor for the House of Representatives that we had in our gallery this afternoon Gen. Ballington Booth, a man who has devoted his life to the relief of suffering humanity and to the spread of the principles of religion and great service to humanity.

Nearly 40 years ago General Booth founded the Volunteers of America, and since the founding of that organization he has remained at its head. Now, nearly 75 years old, but still actively in command of this vigorous Nation-wide movement, General Booth is in Washington and has held several conferences looking toward the improvement of our needy citizens and toward the improvement of our Nation as a whole.

We representatives of the people might well pause in our important labors to pay tribute to this man, whose life and every activity so well exemplify the best that makes up the American Nation.

Like so many of those who have risen by personal achievement to the front rank of American citizens, General Booth is not a native of our country. He was born in Great Britain, a member of a family which at the time of his birth was devoting itself to religious and welfare work.

When a youth he was educated in the Collegiate Institute of Taunton and in the Nottingham Theological Seminary, England.

The humanitarian ideals and religious principles that were imbedded in Ballington Booth as a boy led him as a youth to dedicate his life to their practice. Shortly after leaving school he entered the service of God's needy, in which his father was active.

The conditions which Ballington Booth encountered in his youth in England were even worse than the conditions which have confronted many American cities and towns since the depression. There was untold poverty and distress to be combatted. Ballington Booth went over the British Isles ministering to the spiritual and material needs of those in distress.

As a young man he spent some time in Switzerland, in France, and in India, before he was sent by his father to the Australasian colonies to take charge of welfare and humanitarian work in that then comparatively newly populated continent.

For many years he carried on his public work in a wild but growing country, and Australia remembers to this day the help and guidance which he gave its people nearly 50 years ago.

Forty-eight years ago General Booth came to the United States with his bride, Maud Booth. It was their intention to stay here only a few years, carrying on the welfare work to which both were dedicated.

They have remained here ever since. Within a few months after their arrival in New York, General Booth announced his intention of becoming an American citizen, an intention upon which he promptly acted.

That is an example which many others who have since come to our country might properly follow.

After the Booths had been in America a few years, the idea of the Volunteers of America was born. General Booth conceived the need of a national organization, built upon American principles, and carrying the doctrine of humanity into every city in the country.

With Mrs. Booth at his side, and aided by many outstanding citizens of New York, including the beloved Chauncey M. Depew, William E. Dodge, and Presidents Harrison and

Cleveland, Gen. Ballington Booth founded the Volunteers in New York in 1896.

Such a work as General Booth contemplated for the Volunteers was far from an easy undertaking. It has not been easy. But it has been beneficial to hundreds of thousands of our citizens, and today is growing in the spirit of service to which it is dedicated.

Through steadfast, persistent endeavor General and Mrs. Booth have spread their organization throughout the country. Now, in virtually every large city and in most of the towns of the Nation there is a branch of the Volunteers carrying the message which is the motto of the organization—"For God and country."

In probably every district represented in this House there is a branch of the Volunteers of America. I know that in my home district there is a post which is serving more than 8,000 men, women, and children.

Right here in Washington, on our way to the Capitol, we daily pass a relief station on Pennsylvania Avenue where more than 500 meals are served daily to men, women, and children.

The Volunteers of America on a national scale last year brought relief to more than half a million families by providing shoes, clothing, and other wearing apparel. Food supplies were given to 1,267,000 persons, and 10,000,000 free meals were served.

These figures are cited merely to show how General and Mrs. Booth have built up their essentially American and wholesomely humanitarian organization.

It is to be regretted that there is no way that pictures can be made to show the most commendable work which Mrs. Booth has performed and is performing among the families of those who are in penal institutions. For many years Mrs. Booth has been the head of the Volunteer Prison League and has done much to ease the burden of distress which has fallen upon the shoulders of innocent victims of the law of justice. She has justly won the title, "Little Mother of the Prisoners."

The United States owes much to the Volunteers of America and to the indefatigable and courageous commander, Gen. Ballington Booth.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday, tomorrow, may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION, UNITED STATES AND MEXICO

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 58.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to amounts heretofore authorized to be appropriated, the sum of \$60,000 to defray the expenses of the American Section, International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico, in the conduct of an engineering investigation, study, and report to the Secretary of State to determine the feasibility and best means of effecting the canalization of the Rio Grande from the Caballo Reservoir site in New Mexico to the international diversion dam near El Paso, Tex., in order to facilitate Federal control of the channel of the Rio Grande and compliance by the United States with its obligations to deliver at said international diversion dam water to Mexico pursuant to the convention concluded May 21, 1906, providing for the equitable distribution of waters of the Rio Grande for irrigation purposes, including salaries and wages; fees for professional services; rents; travel expenses; per diem in lieu of actual expenses for subsistence; printing and binding; purchase, exchange, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled passenger- and freight-carrying vehicles; telephone, telegraphic, and air mail communications; ice, equipment, supplies, and materials and other such miscellaneous expenses as the Secretary of State may deem necessary properly to carry out the investigation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, I do not know that there is any special objection to the consideration of

this bill, but gentlemen who are interested are not here at this time, and I think it is too late to take it up. I think the gentleman should make that request tomorrow.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. To whom does the gentleman refer?

Mr. SNELL. I refer to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN] and one or two other gentlemen who are interested in getting some information in regard to this matter. I think the gentleman should let it go over until tomorrow.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I took the matter up with the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and they said they had considered the matter and there was no objection to it.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Did the gentleman have in mind the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

Mr. SNELL. Yes; and I also had in mind the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. DEMPSEY. I have spoken to both of those gentlemen, and they have no objection.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield.

Mr. BACON. As I understand it, the minority members on the Committee on Foreign Affairs are in agreement with this resolution?

Mr. DEMPSEY. They are.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I wish to say that I conferred with the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] last night about this. He had forgotten about it, but after calling it to his attention he said it was thoroughly satisfactory.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to object, but it is really too late at night to bring up an important matter of this kind. I wish the gentleman would let it go over until tomorrow.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Very well, Mr. Speaker. I will bring it up tomorrow then.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his request.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I withdraw the request, Mr. Speaker.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 6, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARING

The House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization will hold public hearings, room 445, House Office Building, at 10 a. m. tomorrow, February 6, on bills—H. J. Res. 71, in relation to return of certain indigents to the Philippine Islands; H. R. 2739, relating to an extension of further time for naturalization of certain alien veterans; H. R. 3472, for extension of time from 3 to 5 years within which certain indigent aliens on voluntary application may be returned to their own country at Government expense.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

193. A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report of its activities and expenditures for December 1934, together with a statement of authorizations made during that month, showing the name, amount, and rate of interest or dividend in each case (H. Doc. No. 92); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

194. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to provide for advancement by selection in the Staff Corps of the Navy to the ranks of lieutenant commander and lieutenant, to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the equalization of promotion of officers of the Staff Corps of the Navy with officers of the line" (44 Stat. 717; U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 34, secs. 348 to 348t), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

195. A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a recommendation of a

proposed new section to be added to the Communications Act of 1934 with reference to foreign communications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

196. A letter from the Federal Power Commission, transmitting a preliminary report covering the charges for electricity to domestic and residential consumers of electricity in cities having a population of 50,000 or more; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

197. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Capt. Russell Willson, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Joint Resolution 148. Joint resolution providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the formulation of the Constitution of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 65). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 101. Resolution relative to the consideration of H. J. Res. 94; without amendment (Rept. No. 66). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DREWRY: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 4016. A bill to repeal section 16 of the act entitled "An act to regulate the distribution, promotion, retirement, and discharge of commissioned officers of the Marine Corps, and for other purposes", approved May 29, 1934; without amendment (Rept. No. 69). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 3465. A bill permitting the laying of pipe lines across New York Avenue NE., in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. TURNER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1073. A bill for the relief of John F. Hatfield; without amendment (Rept. No. 67). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARTER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 3173. A bill for the relief of William H. Stroud; without amendment (Rept. No. 68). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 612) for the relief of Margaret Dunn; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 2410) for the relief of Joseph W. Ludlum and the estate of Oliver Keith Ludlum; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 2969) granting death-compensation benefits to Lena Klotz; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 3911) for the relief of Sarah J. Hitchcock; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 5356) to provide salaried referees and to otherwise amend the Federal Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 5357) to provide for the sound, effective, and uninterrupted operation of the banking system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DALY: A bill (H. R. 5358) to provide for the construction of a courthouse building at Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FORD of California: A bill (H. R. 5359) to establish a national academy for training in public service; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. LUCKEY: A bill (H. R. 5360) providing for punishment for the crime of robbing or attempting to rob custodians of Government moneys or property; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 5361) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5362) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5363) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5364) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5365) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOODRUFF: A bill (H. R. 5366) to provide relief from taxation on certain transactions by reorganized banks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOXEY: A bill (H. R. 5367) for the prevention and removal of obstructions and burdens upon interstate commerce in cotton by regulating transactions on cotton-futures exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 5368) to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Chalmette National Monument in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 5369) exempting part-time employees of non-profit-making organizations in the District of Columbia from the Workmen's Compensation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 5370) providing a penalty for anyone who shall knowingly cause obscene matter to be delivered by mail or to be delivered at the place at which it is directed to be delivered; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HOEPEL: A bill (H. R. 5371) to grant to retired personnel of the armed services equal rights to hospital treatment and domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration facilities as are now extended to veterans of 90 days' service or less; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5372) to grant one increase in rank on retirement to enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEY: A bill (H. R. 5373) to guarantee to persons of every race, color, and creed equal protection of the laws by punishing and deterring the crime of lynching; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNIFFIN: A bill (H. R. 5374) authorizing members of the naval service to whom a commemorative or special medal has been awarded to wear in lieu thereof a miniature facsimile of such medal and a ribbon symbolic of the award; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 5375) relating to the compensation of certain charwomen; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 5376) to promote the national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 5377) to provide allowances for widows and children of World War veterans not entitled to benefits under the act of June 28, 1934,

as enacted; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 5378) to provide dismissal compensation for railroad employees displaced from service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5379) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, by providing for the regulation of the transportation of passengers and property by water carriers operating in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHULTE: A bill (H. R. 5380) to provide for the deportation of certain alien seamen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. TOBEY: A bill (H. R. 5381) to relieve the States and municipalities from Federal taxation on income from operation of publicly owned and operated liquor systems; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 5382) to provide for advancement by selection in the Staff Corps of the Navy to the ranks of lieutenant commander and lieutenant; to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the equalization of promotion officers of the Staff Corps of the Navy with officers of the line" (44 Stat. 717; U. S. C., Supp. VII, title 34, secs. 348 to 348t), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GASSAWAY: A bill (H. R. 5383) to provide old-age compensation for the citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McSWAIN (by request): A bill (H. R. 5384) to amend the act approved July 1, 1918, entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919"; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 5385) for the erection of a public building at Columbus, Lowndes County, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5386) providing payment of pension and increase of pension for disability or death incurred in the regular military or naval service; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLARD: Resolution (H. Res. 102) authorizing and directing the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to inquire into the sale and distribution of stamps by the Postmaster General; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SECREST: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 156) to make available to Congress the services and data of the Interstate Reference Bureau; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CROWE: Joint Resolution (H. J. Res. 157) to authorize a compact or agreement between Kentucky and Indiana with respect to hunting and fishing privileges and other matters relating to jurisdiction on the Ohio River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 9) providing for the printing of 10,000 copies of the preliminary report of the Federal Power Commission in response to Senate Joint Resolution 74, approved April 14, 1934; to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, urging immediate payment of the bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of New York: A bill (H. R. 5387) to authorize the presentation to Guy A. Russell of a Distinguished Service Cross; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRUNNER: A bill (H. R. 5388) for the relief of Ralph J. Lackner; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CARPENTER: A bill (H. R. 5389) for the relief of Fred Ledebuhr; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHRISTIANSON: A bill (H. R. 5390) for the relief of Kildall Fish Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHURCH: A bill (H. R. 5391) for the relief of Matt Kerpan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of New York: A bill (H. R. 5392) granting a pension to Sarah J. Clarkson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAVAGAN: A bill (H. R. 5393) for the relief of Moses Israel; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5394) granting the Congressional Medal of Honor to Matthew G. Rice; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 5395) for the relief of William J. Deasy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5396) for the relief of James A. Cullinane; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5397) for the relief of Thomas J. Boyan; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5398) for the relief of Harry Gordon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HILDEBRANDT: A bill (H. R. 5399) for the relief of Lydia Wakanna; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IGLESIAS: A bill (H. R. 5400) for the relief of Quiterio Caban; to the Committee on Claims.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 5401) for the relief of J. C. Bososa; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 5402) for the relief of Herbert E. Guthrie; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 5403) for the relief of John B. Brack; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 5404) for the relief of Elmer Geske; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'NEAL: A bill (H. R. 5405) for the relief of Robert N. Wallace; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5406) for the relief of Daniel Coakley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 5407) for the relief of the McCune State Bank; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5408) for the reinstatement of Harding Palmer in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH: A bill (H. R. 5409) for the relief of Miles Thomas Barrett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5410) for the relief of T. R. Flinchum; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE: A bill (H. R. 5411) for the relief of Edward J. McCrea; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICH: A bill (H. R. 5412) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Poust; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 5413) granting a pension to Lizzie Baker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 5414) granting a pension to Carrie Clarkson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTSON: A bill (H. R. 5415) to confer jurisdiction on the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Pamlico Timber Corporation against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: A bill (H. R. 5416) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Gentgen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SECREST: A bill (H. R. 5417) for the relief of Harry S. Dyar; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTPHIN: A bill (H. R. 5418) granting a pension to Harriet B. Skene; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 5419) granting a pension to Grace Beams; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON: A bill (H. R. 5420) for the relief of Charles B. Arrington; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 5421) granting a pension to Margaret F. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOLFENDEN: A bill (H. R. 5422) to provide a preliminary examination for the repair of certain breaks in the banks of the Delaware River in Tinicum Township, Delaware County, Pa., with a view to the control of its floods; to the Committee on Flood Control.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

784. By Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts: Petition signed by 187 citizens of Haverhill and Ipswich, Mass., favoring the adoption of the Townsend plan of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

785. By Mr. AYERS: Petition of the Order of Benefit Association of Railway Employees, Division No. 38, Glendive, Mont., urging enactment of legislation to modify the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

786. By Mr. BRUNNER: Resolution of the Central Civic Association, 104-154 One Hundred and Ninety-fourth Street, Hollis, N. Y., urging Congress to enact such legislation that will extend to the distressed home owner the benefits of refinancing as established by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

787. By Mr. BUCKBEE: Petition of Wallace Rowland and other citizens of Shabbona, DeKalb County, Ill., asking Congress to enact House bill 2856 into law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

788. Also, petition of Edward Manson and other residents of Rockford, Ill., calling upon Congress to enact into law the Rogers bill (H. R. 2856); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

789. Also, petition of C. H. Sparrow and other residents of Sycamore, Ill., calling upon Congress to enact into law House bill 2856 (the Rogers old-age-pension bill); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

790. By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: Petition of Knute Paulson and J. E. Cook and five other citizens of Bemidji, Minn., praying for support of fully adequate old-age-pension legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

791. Also, petition of W. P. Larson, of Glyndon, and Morris Seter, of Barnesville, and 37 other citizens of these two communities in the State of Minnesota, praying for passage into law the Townsend old-age-pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

792. By Mr. CARMICHAEL: Petition of W. T. Reed, Mrs. G. W. Scott, T. J. Pounders, Moses Sargent, Robert W. Pawley, J. C. Smith, T. J. Vandiver, Edward Davenport, and others of Colbert County, Ala., favoring House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

793. Also, petition of Emma Slatton, Alice James, L. C. Jones, G. A. St. Clair, Mrs. S. R. Blankenship, Sallie McLe-more, and others of Madison County, Ala., favoring House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

794. Also, petition of B. H. Poole, Z. T. Bell, A. J. Boyett, Sim L. Wiley, Cherie Campbell, and others of Morgan County, Ala., favoring House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

795. Also, petition of Lee James, J. W. Hogan, Noah Wag-non, Annie W. Owen, and others of Limestone County, Ala., favoring House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

796. Also, petition of J. C. Brackin, Joe S. Hill, Jim C. Parker, John L. Lee, John Terry, F. M. Copeland, and others, of Lawrence County, Ala., favoring passage of House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

797. Also, petition of Tennie Vaughn, Senator C. W. Brown, J. M. Brown, Lula Bunch, Jessie Anthony, and others, of Jackson County, Ala., favoring House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

798. Also, petition of L. S. Abernathy, Bridlee Harris, Claude Emerson, B. S. Campbell, Mrs. M. E. Sharp, Nettie

Brewer, E. B. Simmons, R. F. Chandler, C. P. Goins, Mary Joiner, H. A. Alexander, W. C. Riley, Mrs. Etta Williams, and others, of Lauderdale County, Ala., favoring House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

799. By Mr. CHAPMAN: Petition of J. N. Strader, route 7, Lexington, and 17 other citizens of Fayette County, Ky., urging the enactment of old-age pension as outlined in the so-called "Townsend plan"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

800. Also, petition of M. Bailey and 32 other citizens, of Scott County, Ky., urging the enactment of old-age-pension bill as embodied in House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

801. Also, petition of M. F. Pendency and 18 other citizens of Boyle County, Ky., urging the enactment of old-age-pension bill as embodied in House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

802. Also, petition of Hez Watts, Tom Stule, Taylor Anderson, and 16 other citizens, of Harrodsburg, Mercer County, Ky., urging the enactment of old-age-pension bill as embodied in House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

803. Also, petition of Ambrose Wright, Addie L. Hamilton, and 38 other citizens of Scott County, Ky., urging the enactment of old-age-pension bill as embodied in House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

804. Also, petition of Mrs. Pattie Hale and 59 other citizens of Boyle County, Ky., urging the enactment of old-age-pension bill as embodied in House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

805. By Mr. COLE of New York: Petition of the residents of Cohocton, N. Y., and vicinity, favoring legislation for the Townsend plan for old-age revolving pensions, a national plan for recovery and permanent prosperity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

806. Also, petition of the Harry B. Bentley Post, No. 443, of the American Legion of Elmira, N. Y., aiding in the commemoration of the anniversary of Mark Twain; to the Committee on the Library.

807. Also, petition of the residents of Elmira, N. Y., and vicinity favoring legislation for the Townsend plan for old-age revolving pensions, a national plan for recovery and permanent prosperity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

808. Also, petition of residents of Corning, N. Y., and vicinity favoring legislation for the Townsend plan for old-age revolving pensions, a national plan for recovery and permanent prosperity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

809. Also, petition favoring legislation for the Townsend plan of old-age revolving pensions, a national plan for recovery and permanent prosperity, from the residents of Corning, N. Y., and vicinity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

810. Also, petition of the residents of Cameron Mills, N. Y., and vicinity, favoring legislation for the Townsend plan for old-age revolving pensions, a national plan for recovery and permanent prosperity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

811. By Mr. CUMMINGS: Memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Colorado, urging consideration of the Townsend old-age-pension bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

812. By Mr. DEBOUEN: Petition of citizens of Jefferson Davis Parish, La., urging passage of House bill 2856, an old-age-pension bill, by Representative WILL ROGERS; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

813. By Mr. FORD of California: Resolution from the City Council of Los Angeles, approving Joint Resolution No. 46 in the Senate and Joint Resolution No. 135 in the House and urging Senators and Representatives from California to support this joint resolution providing for nationwide telephone investigation by Communications Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

814. By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH: Resolution of the Maryland Farm Bureau Federation, Baltimore, Md., in reference to the consideration of Great Falls as a water-power site to develop electric power for the farmers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

815. Also, resolution of the Maryland Farm Bureau Federation, Baltimore, Md., requesting that the prices of cans be investigated; to the Committee on Agriculture.

816. Also, resolution of the Maryland Farm Bureau Federation, Baltimore, Md., requesting that consideration be given as to ways and means of bettering the conditions in prices for potatoes and tomatoes, either by making them basic crops or through marketing agreements; to the Committee on Agriculture.

817. By Mr. GOODWIN: Petition of the New York State Legislature, memorializing Congress to enact laws whereby regulations may be enforced for the marking and recording the manufacture of firearms, and that such marking and recording be registered with the Department of Justice; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

818. By Mr. GUYER: Petition of the citizens of the Second District of Kansas, urging the enactment of legislation to establish a system of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

819. By Mr. HILDEBRANDT: Petition of Mobridge Division, No. 116, of the Order of Benefit Association of Railway Employees, requesting enactment of legislation to modify the fourth section of the Interstate Commerce Act to regulate commerce so as to permit the railroads to compete with unregulated forms of transportation as recommended by the Federal Coordinator and covered in the Pettengill bill (H. R. 8100); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

820. By Mr. HULL: Petition of Mrs. Frank Laurence and 18 other citizens of Cornell, Wis., favoring the enactment of House bill 2856, relating to Federal old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

821. Also, petition of Mrs. John Grute and 27 other citizens of Cornell, Wis., favoring enactment of House bill 2856, relating to Federal old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

822. Also, petition of Mrs. Gertrude Shipman, 359 Maynard Street, and 50 other citizens of Chippewa Falls, Wis., favoring the enactment of the Townsend old-age-pension plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

823. Also, petition of William Loisselle and 24 other citizens residing at Cornell, Wis., favoring the enactment of House bill 2856, relating to Federal old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

824. Also, petition of N. G. Peeso, 537 Germania Street, and 18 other citizens residing at Eau Claire, Wis., favoring the enactment of House bill 2856, relating to Federal old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

825. Also, petition of O. T. Rudd and 18 other citizens residing at Eau Claire, Wis., favoring the enactment of House bill 2856, relating to Federal old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

826. By Mr. KENNEY: Petition of the Englewood Democratic Club, unanimously favoring the national lottery bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

827. By Mr. KERR: Joint resolution requesting that the Congress of the United States without further delay pass the Frazier-Lemke farm refinance bill, S. 212 and H. R. 2066; to the Committee on Agriculture.

828. By Mr. KVALE: Resolution of the Farmers Unity Club, Milan, Minn., urging legislation providing for motion-picture censorship; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

829. Also, resolution adopted by the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association, urging the imposition of a tax on fatty acids derived from imported vegetable oils and fats; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

830. Also, resolution adopted by the Minnesota Livestock Breeders' Association, urging higher pay to certain private veterinarians temporarily employed by the Federal Govern-

ment in combating Bang's disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

831. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of W. F. Boettcher, of Topeka, Kans., with a number of other signers, opposing such legislation prohibiting the carrying and owning of personal firearms; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

832. Also, petition of O. G. Hannum and other citizens of Nemaha County and Ella Crane and other citizens of Shawnee County, Kans., favoring House bill 2856; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

833. By Mr. LAMNECK: Petition of Garnett L. Shively, of 35 Jefferson Place, and other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, urging for the continuance of the Nye munitions investigation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

834. By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: Petition of certain citizens of Washington County, Md., with reference to old-age-pension legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

835. By Mr. MEAD: Petition of American Federation of Fox and Fur Breeders of Wausau, Wis., regarding removal of the 10-percent luxury tax on furs selling above \$75; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

836. By Mr. MERRITT of New York: Petition of the Central Civic Association of Hollis, Long Island, N. Y., urging Congress to enact at the present session such legislation as will extend to the distressed home owner the benefits of refinancing as established by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

837. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Senate of the State of New York, Albany, urging the Federal Government to enact such laws through the Congress, or to authorize the promulgation of such rules by the Department of Justice or the Interstate Commerce Commission, to compel every manufacturer of firearms to mark such firearms manufactured with a serial number which will be plainly visible, such serial number to be registered with the Department of Justice immediately at the time of the sale, the serial number and to whom such firearm was sold, the Department of Justice thereafter to inform duly authorized police department of the State involved as to the type, serial number, name of consignee, and the name of purchaser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

838. Also, petition of the Ladies' Auxiliary, Branch 2, United National Association of Post Office Clerks, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging pay restoration as of January 1, 1935; to the Committee on Appropriations.

839. By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Petitions from S. E. Payne and 19 other citizens and residents of McCurtain, Okla., urging the enactment of House bill 2856, embracing a Federal system of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

840. By Mr. RYAN: Resolution of the Mankato Division, No. 46, Order of Benefit Association of Railway Employees, favoring enactment of legislation as recommended by the Federal Coordinator and covered in House bill 8100 of the Seventy-third Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

841. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the mayor and council of Bay Head, N. J., favoring an 8-month school year; to the Committee on Education.

842. By Mr. TARVER: Petitions of Sarah Williams and 11 other citizens of Dade County, W. L. Cherry and 30 other citizens of Walker County, I. N. Dutton and 18 other citizens of Floyd County, Mrs. P. J. Champion and 11 other citizens of Gordon County, Ruth Wallace and 13 other citizens of Cobb County, J. B. Lemaster and 14 other citizens of Floyd County, W. H. Carver and 42 other citizens of Floyd County, all of the State of Georgia, favoring old-age pension; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

843. Also, petitions of Major Whitehead and 34 other citizens of Floyd County, G. W. Smith and 14 other citizens and Sallie Hughes and 16 other citizens of Chattooga County, Amanda Martin and 15 other citizens of Cobb County, and R. E. Shadix and 15 other citizens of Douglas County, all of the State of Georgia; favoring old-age pension; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

844. By Mr. THOMASON: Petition of residents of Midland County, Tex., endorsing the Townsend plan of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

845. Also, petition of residents of Brewster County, Tex., endorsing the Townsend plan of old-age-pension legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

846. Also, petition of residents of El Paso County, Tex., endorsing the Townsend plan of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

847. Also, petition of residents of Crane County, Tex., endorsing the Townsend plan of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

848. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of International Workers Order, Branch 124, Cleveland, Ohio, by their secretary, S. Holzman, requesting the enactment of a Federal system of genuine unemployment insurance as contained in the workers act, House bill 2827, in order that their future and the future of all workers, farmers, professionals, and other unemployed and their dependents, may be more secure; to the Committee on Labor.

849. Also, petition of Societa Operaia D' M. S. Mistretta, Cleveland, Ohio, by their secretary, Vincenco Mastropietro, demanding the enactment of a Federal system of genuine unemployment insurance as contained in the Workers' Act, House bill 2827, in order that their future and the future of all workers, farmers, professionals, and other unemployed and their dependents may be more secure; to the Committee on Labor.

850. Also, petition of Marion Central Labor Union, by their general secretary, Ralph K. Ruppert, Marion, Ohio, requesting that 10-cent cigarettes be taxed less than the 15-cent and higher-priced cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

851. Also, petition of Jesse Black and 19 other citizens of Bellaire, Ohio, urging and demanding that Congress enact the old-age-pension bill as sponsored and approved by Dr. J. E. Pope, editor of the National Forum, as embodied in House bill 2856, introduced by Representative WILL ROGERS of Oklahoma, embracing a Federal pension of \$30 to \$50 per month to every man and woman above the age of 55, financed on a contributory basis, or a tax on the earnings of persons between the ages of 21 and 45; same to be free from State and local administration or interference; to be a Nation-wide, impartial, and uniform system of old-age pensions; to the Committee on Labor.

852. Also, petition of Mansfield Master Plumbers Association by their president, William L. Early, and their secretary, C. Edward Millington, urging amendment to \$4,000,000,000 appropriation bill that Government avail itself of facilities to private enterprise and stop Government entry into their industry as proposed bill will have effect continuing inequitable program and severely damage their business by direct purchasing of material and labor; to the Committee on Appropriations.

853. By Mr. TURNER: Petition from Lawrence, Williamson, Giles, Wayne, Maury, Houston, Lewis, and Hickman Counties, Tenn., requesting passage of Dr. J. E. Pope old-age-pension bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

854. By Mr. WHITE: Petition of House Joint Memorial No. 1, Idaho State Legislature, to the President of the United States and the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, urging the passage during the present session of the Congress of a plain, workable old-age-pension law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

855. By Mr. WILLIAMS: Petition of the House of Representatives of the State of Missouri, urging the immediate payment of veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

856. Also, petition of various citizens of Missouri, praying Congress to enact old-age-pension legislation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

857. By Mr. BURCH: Petition of citizens of Charlotte, Halifax, Pittsylvania, Henry, Franklin, Carroll, Patrick, Grayson, and Wythe Counties, Va., urging passage of old-age-pension legislation as embodied in House bill 2856, by Representative WILL ROGERS; to the Committee on Ways and Means.